

HUMAN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES TRIPOS

PART IIA / POL 7

HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT
to c.1700

COURSE GUIDE
2024 – 2025

Course organiser (POLIS): Dr Tom Hopkins th268@cam.ac.uk

Table of Contents

This paper guide is optimized for use with the 'Navigation Pane' function on MS Word, found with the 'View' options. Please enable this to better navigate the document.

1. Introduction to the History of Political Thought papers	3
2. Introduction to the period	3
3. How to study for this paper	4
4. Structure of the paper	5
5. Lectures	6
6. The examination	7
7. Sample examination paper	7
8. The reading lists	9
A1 Plato	10
A2 Aristotle	11
A3 Augustine	13
A4 Marsilius of Padua	14
A5 Thomas More	16
A6 Machiavelli	18
A7 Hobbes	20
A8 Locke	22
B9 Slavery (Theme)	24
B10 Early Christian Political Thought	27
B11 Temporal and Spiritual in Medieval Political Thought	29
B12 Medieval Islamic Political Thought	31
B13 Animals, Nature and the Environment (Theme)	33
B14 Monarchy and Republicanism (Theme)	36
B15 Obedience and Resistance in Reformation Political Thought	39
B16 Reason of State	41
B17 Sovereignty	43
B18 Political Thought of the British Revolutions	46
B19 Gender and Political Thought (Theme)	49
B20 Colonial Empire (Theme)	52
Appendix: Examiners' Reports	55

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 HSPS. 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 (where the paper is known as Part IB T1). 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 do not 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 is being said. But if you have thoughts like this, it is worth exploring the other side of the coin. It is 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 I paper, POL1) 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. Topics on animals, gender, slavery, monarchy and republicanism, colonialism and Islamic political thought, broaden the range of political actors the paper considers and extend its scope beyond the bounds of Western Europe.

3. How to study for this paper

Lectures: because the material to be covered spans a wide chronological and thematic range, and also because many students will not have studied the history of political thought before, a comprehensive array of lectures is offered. This need not cause you alarm since you are not required or expected to attend them all. Lecturers are encouraged to place their outlines, bibliographies and other material on the paper's Moodle site in advance of the lecture. 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 twenty topics that make up the syllabus, in preparation for answering three questions in the examination (including at least one question from each of sections A and B). 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 is 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.

4. Structure of the paper

'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 in their own time.

Other B topics 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.

Bibliographies for all the 'B' 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.

Section A: Authors

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

Section B: Topics

9. Slavery (*Theme*)
10. Romans and Christians
11. Spiritual and temporal power
12. Medieval Islamic political thought
13. Animals, nature and the 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*)

5. Lectures

For guidance as to which lectures will be most relevant to your course of studies, you are advised to get in touch with your supervisor as early as possible in Michaelmas term. It is not expected that students will attend all the lectures advertised, but you are strongly encouraged to attend lectures on the topics that you are covering.

Lecture handouts and announcements are made available through Moodle.

Lectures are organized by the History Faculty. The Lecture List can be found [here](#).

MICHAELMAS	LENT
<p><u>Tues. 9am (Law Faculty, LG19)</u></p> <p>Greek and Roman political thought from Plato to the early Christians Dr Magnus Ryan (wks 1-4)</p> <p>Spiritual and temporal power from Augustine to Marsilius Dr Magnus Ryan (wks 5-8)</p>	<p><u>Tues. 9am (Law Faculty, LG19)</u></p> <p>More, Machiavelli, republicanism and monarchy Dr Richard Serjeantson (wks 1-4)</p> <p>Hobbes, sovereignty and reason of state Prof. Annabel Brett (wks 5-8)</p>
<p><u>Wed. 9am (Law Faculty, LG17)</u></p> <p>Medieval Islamic political thought Dr Magnus Ryan (wks 1-2)</p> <p>Slavery Prof. Annabel Brett (wks 3-4)</p> <p>Gender Prof. Annabel Brett (wks 5-6)</p> <p>Animals, nature and the environment Prof. Annabel Brett (wks 7-8)</p>	<p><u>Wed. 9am (Law Faculty, LG17)</u></p> <p>Obedience and resistance from the Reformation to the British civil wars Dr Magnus Ryan and Prof. Annabel Brett (wks 1-4)</p> <p>Locke Prof. Annabel Brett (wks 5-6)</p> <p>Colonialism Dr Richard Serjeantson (wks 7-8)</p>

EASTER: Two revision lectures

Prof. Annabel Brett and Dr Magnus Ryan

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.

Links to 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. Sample examination paper

Answer THREE questions, at least ONE from EACH section.

Section A

1. How successfully does Plato's ideal city satisfy the requirements of human nature?
2. 'The good legislator and true statesman ought to be acquainted not only with the best in an unqualified sense, but also with the best in the circumstances' [ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, Book IV]. How does the Aristotelian political scientist think about the difference between the two?
3. What was the importance of order in Augustine's political thought?
4. What was the role of consent in Marsilius of Padua's political theory?
5. How far is Utopia's 'equal and just distribution of goods' the expression of a democratic ideal?
6. Do the arguments of Machiavelli's Discourses imply that he rejected the teachings of The Prince?
7. Why was Hobbes in Leviathan so insistent upon correct speech?
8. What is the role of the 'Appeal to Heaven' in Locke's political thought?

Section B

9. 'For all the controversy it generated, the idea of natural slavery remained central to the legitimation of the practice.' How far is this true for the period before c.1700?
10. What significance did classical virtue have for early Christian political theorists?
11. 'The debates over the relationship between secular and papal power in the decades around 1300 turned principally on the concept of nature.' Discuss.
12. What was the political community envisaged by Islamic philosophers?
13. Were animals the 'other' of the human in the period before c.1700?
14. Did God prefer kings?
15. 'If resistance theory had any historical constant, it was the figure of the inferior magistrate.' Discuss.
16. What was the 'reason' in 'reason of state'?
17. What space, if any, did early modern theories of sovereignty leave for political actors other than the sovereign?
18. Examine the role of the concept of 'mixed polity' in the political thought of the British civil wars.
19. How far are we justified in seeing a progression in the conception of female political agency in the period to c.1700? Answer with respect to **any two or more** of the periods you have studied (Ancient; Medieval; Renaissance; Early Modern).
20. To what extent did a Machiavellian vision of colonial expansion dominate European thinking on empire across the early modern period?

8. The reading lists

For Section A, you are assigned one or more set texts for each topic. It is expected that you will be familiar with all of the set texts assigned for a given topic by the time you sit the exam, but for the supervision your supervisor may advise you to concentrate in the first instance on one text in particular, or on certain sections of a longer text. Your primary goal should be to engage carefully and analytically with the set texts.

The aim of Section B is to allow you to consider the general context in political thought within which the ideas of major political thinkers developed. The primary texts suggested in Section B therefore have a different status from the set texts in Section A. You need not master every one of the Section B primary texts but need to show evidence of engagement with texts relating to each topic. A good rule of thumb is to have engaged with 2-3 primary texts ahead of the supervision, but with shorter texts your supervisor may advise you to tackle more than this. For the Section B 'Theme' topics, make sure to cover texts from different periods of time – the idea is to think about the ways in which these themes were discussed in different contexts. Discuss with your supervisor which texts you will read ahead of the supervision.

Secondary reading lists are designed to indicate some useful introductory works or major interpretations of thinkers or themes, as well as offering pointers for further reading on particular aspects of a topic. They are not intended as a checklist, and there is no expectation that you will read every text on a given topic. Your supervisor will guide you in your reading for supervisions. You may then return to the reading list for further reading on any aspect of an author or topic that particularly interests you, and for revision reading. Though you may sometimes find it useful to begin by reading an introductory secondary text, make sure to prioritize the primary texts if pushed for time.

Works marked with an asterisk * are suggested as helpful introductions or as particularly important interpretations of the author or topic.

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover (<http://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk>).

(M) = Available via Moodle

(EEBO) = Facsimile of original available on Early English Books Online (<https://www.proquest.com/eebo>).

A1. PLATO

Set text

PLATO, *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. 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., *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic* (2007). (E)

* A. Laks, 'Legislation and demiurgy: on the relation between Plato's Republic and Laws', *Classical Antiquity*, 9 (1990), 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* (2014); available online in its American edition as, *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].

Sample Questions

1. Is Plato's ideal city best seen as an attempt to satisfy the requirements of human nature?
2. Is Plato's project in Republic utopian?
3. How important is the city in Plato's attempt to demonstrate that the lives of the just are happier than the lives of the unjust?
4. 'Isn't it appropriate for the rational element to rule, because it is wise and takes thought for the entire soul...?' [PLATO, Republic, Book IV]. Discuss.
5. Who among the citizens of Plato's ideal city can be happy? [2024]

A2. ARISTOTLE

Set texts

ARISTOTLE, *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)

ARISTOTLE, *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, *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought* (2000) (E)

Rorty = A.O. Rorty, ed., *Essays on Aristotle's 'Ethics'* (1980).

J. Annas, *The Morality of Happiness* (1993), sections on Aristotle. (E)

J. Barnes, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle* (1995). (E)

M.F. Burnyeat, 'Aristotle on learning to be good', in Rorty, ch. 5.

J. Frank, *A Democracy of Distinction* (2005).

* J. Lear, *Aristotle: The desire to understand* (1988). (E)

R.G. Mulgan, 'Aristotle and the value of political participation', *Political Theory*, 18 (1990), 195–215. (E)

W.R. Newell, 'Superlative virtue: the problem of monarchy in Aristotle's Politics', in *Essays on the Foundations of Aristotelian Political Science*, ed. C. Lord and D.K. O'Connor (1991).

M.C. Nussbaum, 'Shame, separateness, and political unity: Aristotle's criticism of Plato', in Rorty.

M.C. Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness* (1986), chs 11–12.

* J. Ober, *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual critics of popular rule* (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 Schofield, *Saving the City* (1999), ch. 6.

* ———, 'Aristotle: an introduction', in CHGRPT, pp. 310–20. (E)

* B. Yack, *The Problems of a Political Animal: Community, justice and conflict in Aristotelian political thought* (1993).

Sample Questions

1. Does Aristotle have an answer to his own question, whether the best law or the best man should rule?
2. 'We should consider not only what form of government is best, but also what is possible and what is easily attainable by all' [ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, Book IV]. What impact did this insight have on the rest of Aristotle's political thought?
3. What was Aristotle's concept of a constitution (*politeia*), and what role did it play in his political thought?
4. What importance does Aristotle attach to equality?
5. 'Claims to political rights must be based on the ground of contribution to the elements which constitute the being of the state' (ARISTOTLE, *Politics* X, 12). What follows from this in Aristotle's political theory? [2024]

A3. AUGUSTINE

Set text

AUGUSTINE, *The City of God against the Pagans*, trans. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge, 1998) or *Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth, 1972), esp. bks II–V, VIII, XI–XXII. Alternatively, see, 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., *Trends in Medieval Political Thought* (1965).

— — —, *Augustine of Hippo* (1967).

H. Chadwick, *The Early Church* (1967), ch. 15.

— — —, *Augustine* (1986). (E)

P. Garnsey, *Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine* (1996), chs 13–14.

J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (1987), chs 2–3.

J. von Heyking, 'A headless body politic? Augustine's understanding of populus and its representation', *History of Political Thought*, 20 (1999). (E)

R.L. Holmes, 'St. Augustine and the justification of war', in Holmes, *On War and Morality* (1989). (E)

E.J. Hundert, 'Augustine and the sources of the divided self', *Political Theory*, 20 (1992), 86–104. (E)

* R.A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine* (1970). (E)

* — — —, 'The Latin Fathers', in J.H. Burns, ed., *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c.350–c.1450* (1988), ch. 6. (E)

— — —, 'Saint Augustine's views on the just war', *Studies in Church History*, 20 (1983), 1–13.

* R. Martin, 'The two cities in Augustine's political philosophy', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 33 (1972), 195–216. (E)

P. Ramsey, 'The just war according to St Augustine', in J.B. Elshtain, ed., *Just War Theory* (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* (2012). (E)

R. Williams, 'Politics and the soul: a reading of the City of God', *Milltown Studies*, 19 (1987), 55–72.

Sample Questions

1. 'Augustine provided a new rationale for human community.' Discuss.
2. What was the importance of order in Augustine's political thought?
3. How did Augustine's conception of a city (civitas) serve his purposes in *The City of God*?
4. 'There is nothing so sociable by nature and anti-social by corruption as man.' What makes political life possible for Augustine?
5. What does citizenship mean for Augustine? [2024]

A.4 MARSILIUS OF PADUA

Set text

MARSILIUS OF PADUA, *The Defender of the Peace*, tr. A.S. Brett (Cambridge, 2005). (E)

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviations:

Moreno-Riaño = G. Moreno-Riaño, ed., *The World of Marsilius of Padua* (Turnhout, 2006). (E)

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

Mulieri et al. = A. Mulieri, S. Masolini and J. Pelletier, eds, *Marsilius of Padua. Between History, Politics, and Philosophy* (Turnhout, 2023).

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

* Canning, Joseph, *Ideas of power in the late middle ages, 1296-1417* (Cambridge, 2011), esp. Ch. 3 (E)

* 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 Mittelalters / Political Thought in the Age of Scholasticism* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 209–23 (or his chapter in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman).

Garnett, George, *Marsilius of Padua and 'the truth of history'* (Oxford, 2006). (E)

* Lambertini, Roberto, 'Marsilius and the poverty controversy in Dictio II', in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman, pp. 229–63. (E)

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

Mulieri, Alessandro, 'Marsilius of Padua on representation', *History of Political Thought*, 38 (2017), 623–43.

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 Mittelalters / Political Thought in the Age of Scholasticism* (Leiden, 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, 2018), pp. 49–56. (E)

———, 'Medicine and the body politic in Marsilius of Padua's Defensor Pacis', in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman, pp. 71–115. (E)

Sample Questions

1. Which had more impact on the political theory of the *Defensor pacis*, Padua or Paris?
2. Can we describe Marsilius of Padua as a republican?
3. How did Marsilius's understanding of the early church impact on his proposals for its future?
4. Which was more important to Marsilius's political vision, imperial history or Aristotle's *Politics*?
5. How naturalistic is Marsilius of Padua's vision of political life? [2024]

A5. THOMAS MORE

Set text

THOMAS MORE, *Utopia* [1516], tr. G.M. Logan and R.M. Adams, 3rd edn (Cambridge, 2016). (E)

Suggested secondary reading

- * D. Baker-Smith, *More's 'Utopia'* (1991; repr. 2000). (E)
- * B. Bradshaw, 'More on Utopia', *Historical Journal*, 24 (1981), 1–27. (E)
- J.C. Davis, *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A study of English utopian writing, 1516–1700* (1981), ch. 2.
- R. Dealy, *Before Utopia: The making of Thomas More's mind* (2020), esp. pts VI–VIII. (E)
- D. Fenlon, 'England and Europe: Utopia and its aftermath', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 25 (1975), 115–35. (E)
- A. Fox, *Thomas More: History and Providence* (1982), ch. 2.
- , *'Utopia': An Elusive Vision* (1993).
- J. Guy, *Thomas More* (2000).
- J. Hankins, 'Humanism and the origins of modern political thought', in J. Kraye, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (1996), ch. 7. (E)
- J.H. Hexter and E. Surtz, 'Introduction', to More, *Utopia*, eds J.H. Hexter and E. Surtz (*The Complete Works of St Thomas More*, vol. IV) (1965).
- J.H. Hexter, 'The loom of language and the fabric of imperatives: the case of Il Principe and Utopia', in Hexter, *The Vision of Politics on the Eve of the Reformation* (1973).
- G.M. Logan, *The Meaning of More's 'Utopia'* (1983). (E)
- * E. Nelson, 'Greek nonsense in More's Utopia', *Historical Journal*, 44 (2001), 889–918 (E); rev. in Nelson, *The Greek Tradition in Republican Thought* (2004), ch. 1. (E)
- J.M. Parrish, 'A new source for More's Utopia', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), 493–98. (E)
- J. Paul, *Thomas More* (2017), ch. 2.
- * Q. Skinner, 'Sir Thomas More's Utopia and the language of Renaissance humanism', in *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*, ed. A. Pagden (1987), ch. 6 (E); rev. in Skinner, *Visions of Politics* (3 vols; 2002), vol. II: *Renaissance Virtues*, ch. 8. (E)
- R. Tuck, 'Humanism and political thought', in A. Goodman and A. Mackay, eds, *The Impact of Humanism in Western Europe* (1990). (E)
- G.B. Wegemer, *Young Thomas More and the Arts of Liberty* (2011), ch. 9. (E)
- T.I. White, 'Pride and the public good: Thomas More's use of Plato in Utopia', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 22 (1982), 329–54. (E)
- D. Wootton, 'Introduction', to More, *Utopia: With Erasmus's 'The Sileni of Alcibiades'* (1999).

Sample Questions

1. Does More's Utopia make good on its paradoxical claim that although no one there owns anything, everyone is rich?

2. How far is Utopia's 'equal and just distribution of goods' the expression of a democratic ideal?
3. Are the politics of the 'new island' of Utopia as virtuous as Raphael Hythloday suggests?
4. What is the significance of More's suggestion that Utopia might represent 'The best state of the commonwealth'?
5. 'The desirability of abolishing private property is the central argument of Thomas More's *Utopia*; the political arrangements of the "new island" are much less consequential.'
Discuss. [2024]

A6. MACHIAVELLI

Set texts

NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI, *The Prince* [written 1513; publ. 1532], ed. Q. Skinner, trans. R. Price (Cambridge, 1988) (E) or trans. P. Bondanella (Oxford, 2015). (E)

NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI, *Discourses on Livy* [written c.1518; publ. 1531], trans. J.C. and P. Bondanella (Oxford, 2003) (E) (recommended) or trans. B. Crick (Penguin, 1970).

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation: *Machiavelli and Republicanism* = G. Bock, Q. Skinner and M. Viroli, eds, *Machiavelli and Republicanism* (1990). (E)

J. Jackson Barlow, 'The fox and the lion: Machiavelli replies to Cicero', *History of Political Thought*, 20 (1999), 627–45. (E)

V. Cox, 'Machiavelli and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: deliberative rhetoric in *The Prince*', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 28 (1997), 1109–1141. (E)

* F. Gilbert, *Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and history in sixteenth-century Italy* (1984). (E)

W. Hanasz, 'The common good in Machiavelli', *History of Political Thought*, 31 (2010), 57–85. (E)

J.H. Hexter, '*Il Principe* and *lo stato*', in Hexter, *The Vision of Politics on the Eve of the Reformation* (1973). (E)

M. Hörnqvist, *Machiavelli and Empire* (2005), chs 2–4. (E)

J.M. Najemy, 'Machiavelli on the necessity of interpreting religion', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 60 (1999), 659–8. (E)

* J. M. Najemy, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Machiavelli* (2010). (E)

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

J.G.A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment* (1975; with new postscript, 2003), esp. pt II. (E)

R. Price, 'The senses of *virtù* in Machiavelli', *European Studies Review*, 3 (1973), 315–45. (E)

———, 'The theme of *gloria* in Machiavelli', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 30 (1977), 588–631. (E)

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

Q. Skinner, *Machiavelli* (1981; new edn, 2000). (E)

———, 'Republican virtues in an age of princes', in Skinner, *Visions of Politics* (3 vols; 2002), vol. II, ch. 5, esp. pp. 142–59. (E)

* ———, 'Machiavelli's *Discorsi* and the pre-humanist origin of republican ideas', in *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, ch. 6. (E)

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

* P. Stacey, *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (2007), part v. (E)

———, 'Definition, division and difference in Machiavelli's political philosophy', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 75 (2014), 189–212. (E)

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

———, *Machiavelli* (1998). (E)

———, *From Politics to Reason of State* (1992). (E)

Sample Questions

1. What is the significance of Machiavelli's claim, in his Discourses on Livy, that the ancient Romans were more virtuous than they were fortunate?
2. Do the arguments of Machiavelli's Discourses imply that he rejected the teachings of The Prince?
3. What best explains Machiavelli's insistence that both principalities and republics should look to antiquity for political examples?
4. What follows from Machiavelli's contention that, 'In every republic there are two different dispositions, that of the populace and that of the upper class' [MACHIAVELLI, Discourses on Livy, Book I]?
5. 'A prince who is not regulated by the laws will commit the very same errors as an uncontrolled crowd of people' (MACHIAVELLI, *The Discourses*, I, 58). Can this assertion be reconciled with what Machiavelli argues in *The Prince*? [2024]

A7. HOBBS

Set text

THOMAS HOBBS, *Leviathan* [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

Abbreviations:

Sorell, *Companion* = T. Sorell, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996). (E)

Skinner, *Visions* = Q. Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 2002), vol. III: *Hobbes and Civil Science*. (E)

M.M. Goldsmith, 'Hobbes on law', in Sorell, *Companion*, ch. 11 (E)

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

———, 'Hobbesian equality', in S. Lloyd, ed., *Hobbes Today* (Cambridge, 2013). (E)

D. Johnston, *The Rhetoric of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes and the politics of cultural transformation* (Princeton, 1986).

S. Lloyd, *Ideals as Interests in Hobbes's 'Leviathan'* (Cambridge, 1992). (E)

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

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

J.G.A. Pocock, 'Time, history and eschatology in the thought of Thomas Hobbes', in Pocock, *Politics, Language and Time* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 148–201.

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

A. Ryan, 'Hobbes's political philosophy', in Sorell, *Companion*, ch. 9. (E)

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

Q. Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996). (E)

* ———, 'Hobbes on representation,' *European Journal of Philosophy*, 13 (2005), 155–84. (E)

* ———, *Hobbes and Republican Liberty* (Cambridge, 2008).

T. Sorell and G.A.J. Rogers, eds, *Hobbes and History* (London, 2000). (E)

T. Sorell, *Hobbes* (Oxford, 1986), esp. chs 1–2, 8–10.

* J.P. Sommerville, *Thomas Hobbes: Political ideas in historical context* (London, 1992).

P. Springborg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes's 'Leviathan'* (Cambridge, 2007). (E)

S. Sreedhar, *Hobbes on Resistance: Defying the Leviathan* (Cambridge, 2010). (E)

R. Tuck, 'The civil religion of Thomas Hobbes', in N. Phillipson and Q. Skinner, eds, *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 120–38. (E)

———, 'Hobbes and democracy', and the reply by K. Hoekstra, 'A lion in the house', both in A.S. Brett and J. Tully, eds, *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006). (E)

Sample Questions

1. 'Covenants, without the Sword, are but Words' [HOBBS, *Leviathan*, Chapter 17]. Is the sword the only thing that prevents the Hobbesian commonwealth from falling apart?
2. 'For in a way beset with those that contend, on one side for too great Liberty, and on the other side for too much Authority, 'tis hard to passe between the points of both unwounded' [THOMAS HOBBS, *Leviathan*, Dedicatory Epistle]. Discuss.
3. Why was Hobbes in *Leviathan* so insistent upon correct speech?
4. What role does consent play in Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*?
5. 'For in a way beset with those that contend, on one side for too great Liberty, and on the other side for too much Authority, 'tis hard to passe between the points of both unwounded' (HOBBS, *Leviathan*, Dedicatory Epistle). Did Hobbes succeed in doing so? [2024]

A8. LOCKE

Set texts

JOHN LOCKE, 'Second Treatise of Government' [written c.1682; publ. 1689 (dated 1690)], in *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. P. Laslett (Cambridge, 1988), or in Locke, *Second Treatise of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, 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. C.B. Macpherson (1980). (E)

JOHN LOCKE, *A Letter Concerning Toleration* [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 *Two Treatises of Government*', *Political Theory*, 32 (2004), 602–27. (E)

R. Ashcraft, 'Revolutionary politics and Locke's *Two Treatises*', *Political Theory*, 8 (1980), 429–86. (E)

R. Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and John Locke's 'Two Treatises of Government'* (1986). (E)

D. Baumgold, *Contract Theory in Historical Context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke* (2010).

J. Dunn, *The Political Thought of John Locke* (1969). (E)

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

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

M. Goldie, 'John Locke and Anglican Royalism', *Political Studies*, 31 (1983), 61–85. (E)

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

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

J. Milton, 'Dating Locke's Second Treatise', *History of Political Thought*, 16 (1995), 356–90. (E)

J. Scott, *England's Troubles* (2000), ch. 16. (E)

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

* A.J. Simmons, *On the Edge of Anarchy: Locke, consent and the limits of society* (1993). (E)

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

J. Tully, *A Discourse on Property* (1980). (E)

* ———, *An Approach to Political Theory: Locke in contexts* (1993), esp. ch. 1. (E)

J. Waldron, *God, Locke, and Equality* (2002). (E)

Sample Questions

1. For what reasons did Locke set out to show the differences between 'a Ruler of a Commonwealth, a Father of a Family, and a Captain of a Galley' [LOCKE, *Second Treatise of Government*, Chapter 1]?
2. What is the role of the 'Appeal to Heaven' in Locke's political thought?
3. To what extent does Locke's argument in *Two Treatises of Government* depend on the concept of trust?
4. Why was Locke so favourable to prerogative and executive power?
5. What is the role of law in the argument of Locke's *Second Treatise*? [2024]

B9. SLAVERY (*Theme*)

Introduction

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 within the Christian and classical tradition from antiquity to the end of the seventeenth century. One central thread is over the existence of slaves by nature, posited by Aristotle, controversial again in the Iberian debate over the conquest of America in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Another concerns the practice of enslavement of war captives; nearly all 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. Although many recognise at least some immorality or inhumanity in what they are legitimating, arguments for wholesale abolition are barely visible at all.

Suggested Primary Reading

For editions of Aristotle, Augustine and Locke see under relevant A topics.

4th cent. BCE ARISTOTLE, *The Politics*, Book I, Chh. 3–7.

5th cent. CE AUGUSTINE, *The City of God*, Book XIX, Ch. 15 and 16.

1274 THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa theologiae*, Ia Q. 96 a. 3, a. 4; IIaIIae Q. 104 a. 5, a. 6, in *Aquinas. Political Writings*, ed. R. Dyson (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 1–4 and pp. 68–71. (E)

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 *Vitoria. Political Writings*, ed. A. Pagden and J. Lawrance (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 247–251, 318–319. (E)

1547 JUAN GINÉS DE SEPÚLVEDA, *Democrates secundus* (excerpt), in Derek Hughes, ed., *Versions of Blackness* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 285–6. (E)

1577 JOSE DE ACOSTA, *De procuranda indorum salute*, tr. G. Stewart McIntosh (Tayport, 1996), Vol. I, Preface; Book I Ch. 7-8; Book II Ch. 5; Book III Ch. 18 (M)

- 1576 JEAN BODIN, *Six bookes of a commonweale*, tr. R. Knolles (London, 1606), Book I, Ch. 5 (EEBO)
<https://www.proquest.com/eebo/results/4576988C5CB454BPQ/1?accountid=9851>
- 1598 ALBERICO GENTILI, *The Law of War*, trans. J.C. Rolfe (Oxford, 1933), Bk III, Ch. 9 'On slaves'. (M)
- 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)
- 1682/9 JOHN LOCKE, *Second Treatise*, Ch. 4 'Of slavery'; Ch. 16, 'Of conquest', esp. §§178–182. (E)

Suggested Secondary Reading

Antiquity

Agamben, Giorgio, *The Use of Bodies*, Ch. 1, in *The Omnibus Homo Sacer* (Stanford, 2017), pp. 1029–1048. (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)

Thomas Aquinas and the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Iberian debate

Cornish, Paul J., 'Marriage, slavery and natural rights in the political thought of Aquinas', *The Review of Politics*, 60 (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 *Civilization – Nature – Subjugation: Variations of (De-)Colonization*, ed. C. Müller et al. (Frankfurt, 2021). (E)

Ireton, Chloe, 'Black Africans' freedom litigation suits to define just war and just slavery in the early Spanish empire', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 73 (2020), 1277–1319. (E)

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), Ch. 2-5.

* Pagden, Anthony, *The fall of natural man. The American Indian and the origins of comparative ethnology* (Cambridge, 1982), esp. Ch. 3, 4 and 7.

* 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., *A Companion to Early Modern Spanish Imperial, Political and Social Thought* (Leiden, 2020), pp. 295–317 (see also Ch. 6 and 9 in the same volume). (E)

* Tierney, Brian, 'Aristotle and the American Indians – again. Two critical discussions', *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 12 (1991), 295–322. (E)

James W. Fuerst, *New world postcolonial. The political thought of Inca Garcilaso de la Vega* (Pittsburgh, 2018), Ch. 6 (on Inca Garcilaso's reading of Acosta); Appendix (E)

Slavery and the law of war

* Allain, Jean, *Slavery in International Law* (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', *Grotiana*, 22/23 (2001), 197–231. (E)

James Farr, 'Locke, natural law and new world slavery', *Political Theory*, 36 (2008). (E)

Stelder, Mikki, 'The colonial difference in Hugo Grotius: rational man, slavery and indigenous dispossession', *Postcolonial Studies*, 25 (2022), 564–583. (E)

William Uzgalis, 'John Locke, racism, slavery and Indian lands', in N. Zack, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy and Race* (Oxford, 2017). (E)

Sample Questions

1. 'For all the controversy it generated, the idea of natural slavery remained central to the legitimisation of the practice.' How far is this true for the period before c.1700?
2. What was the relationship between the justification of slavery and the justification of war?
3. How far were religious ideals a factor in both the critique and the defence of slavery in the period before c.1700?
4. Was justice the dominant moral value in the theorising the practice of slavery?
5. Which was more prominent in the justification of slavery in the period to c.1700, nature or sin? [2024]

B10. EARLY CHRISTIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Introduction

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

ST PAUL, Epistle to the Romans, ch. 13, New Testament. (E)

TERTULLIAN, *Apology* (Loeb, 1984). (E)

LACTANTIUS, *Divine Institutes*, trans. A. Bowen and P. Garnsey (Liverpool, 2003), bks 3–5 [not available online, but see trans. by M.F. McDonald (1955) (E)].

AMBROSE, *De officiis*, ed. and trans. I.J. Davidson, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2001), I.105–74, III.1–52, pp. 179–219, 345–87. (E)

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

AUGUSTINE, *The City of God*, trans. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge, 1998), bks 2–5, 8, 19.

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 is online at <https://ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf212/npnf212.iii.iv.i.html>.]

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)

———, *The Early Church* (London, 1968).

- J.F. Childress, 'Moral discourse about war in the early church,' in *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, 37 (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).
- * ———, '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, 1985).
- N. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and court in a Christian capital* (Berkeley, 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 also above, A3, under Augustine.

Sample Questions

1. How did early Christian thinkers account for Rome's success?
2. How easily did the universalism of the Christian message sit with Roman political conceptions?
3. In what ways did early Christian political thinkers subvert classical thought?
4. How did early Christian writers respond to Roman conceptions of citizenship?
5. 'The commonwealth cannot possibly function without justice' (CICERO, *On the Commonwealth* II, 70). Did early Christian thinkers agree? [2024]

B11. TEMPORAL AND SPIRITUAL IN MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THOUGHT

Introduction

Almost from its 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 trans. by G. Lewis (1908) at <https://archive.org/details/bernarddeclirvau00bernuoft/page/n4/>].

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 *Novit* and *Quod super his*, in Tierney, *Crisis*, pp. 153–6.

HOSTIENSIS, selections from commentary on *Per venerabilem* and *Solitae*, in Tierney, *Crisis*, 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, *On Royal and Papal Power*, trans. J.A. Watt (Toronto, 1971) [not available online, but see the trans. by A.P. Monahan (1974) (E)].

GILES OF ROME, *On Ecclesiastical Power*, 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, *The Defender of the Peace*, 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., *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350–c.1450* (Cambridge, 1988). (E)

J.P. Canning, *Ideas of Power in the Late Middle Ages 1296–1417* (Cambridge, 2011). (E)

J.R. Eastman, 'Giles of Rome and Celestine V: The Franciscan revolution and the theology of abdication', *Catholic Historical Review*, 76 (1990), 195–211. (E)

- K. Froehlich, 'St. Peter, Papal Primacy, and the exegetical tradition, 1150–1300', in C. Ryan, ed., *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and realities 1150–1300* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 3–44.
- G.S. Garnett, *Marsilius of Padua and 'the truth of history'* (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, *Church and Government in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 205–22.
- * ———, 'Hierarchy in the late middle ages', in J.P. Canning and O.-G. Oexle, eds, *Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages* (Göttingen, 1998), pp. 113–26.
- K. Pennington, 'Law, legislation and government, 1150–1300', in *CHMPT*, pp. 444–53. (E)
- W.H. Principe, 'The school theologians' views of the papacy, 1150–1250', in *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and realities, 1150–1300*, ed. C. Ryan (Toronto, 1989), pp. 45–116.
- * B. Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge, 1955). (E)
- , *The Crisis of Church & State, 1050–1300* (1964; Toronto, 1988), pp. 127–31, pp. 150–53.
- , 'The continuity of papal political theory in the thirteenth century. Some methodological considerations', *Mediaeval Studies*, 27 (1965), pp. 227–45. (E)
- * W. Ullmann, 'Boniface VIII and his contemporary scholarship', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 27 (1976), pp. 58–87 (E); repr. in Ullmann, *Scholarship and Politics in the Middle Ages* (1978).
- , *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages* (4th edn; London, 1978), pp. 231–79.
- * J.A. Watt, 'Spiritual and temporal powers', in *CHMPT*, pp. 367–423. (E)
- * ———, *The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1965).
- , 'Hostiensis on *Per venerabilem*: the role of the College of Cardinals', in B. Tierney and P. Linehan, eds, *Authority and Power* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 99–113.

Sample Questions

1. 'Later medieval debate about spiritual and temporal power was essentially about the papal office.' Discuss.
2. 'The debates over the relationship between secular and papal power in the decades around 1300 turned principally on the concept of nature.' Discuss.
3. Account for the differing significance attributed to sin by political polemicists around 1300.
4. To what extent was the disagreement between pro- and anti-papal writers in the Middle Ages a disagreement about jurisdictional claims?
5. Were enemies of papal claims attempting to turn the Church into a polity like any other?
[2024]

B12. MEDIEVAL ISLAMIC POLITICAL THOUGHT

Introduction

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, *Al-Madina al-fadila*, in Richard Walzer, ed. and tr., *Al-Farabi on the Perfect State* (Oxford, 1985).

— — —, *Siyasa al-madiniyya* [‘The Political Regime’], in Charles E. Butterworth, ed. and tr., *Al-Farabi. The political writings*, Vol. II (Ithaca, 2020), pp. 60–94. (E)

AVICENNA (IBN SINA), *On the Divisions of the Rational Sciences*; and

AVICENNA (IBN SINA), *Healing: Metaphysics X*, chaps 2–5, both in:

Ralph Lerner and Muhsin Mahdi, eds, *Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook* (Ithaca, 2011), pp. 96–7 and 98–109.

AVERROES (IBN RUSHD), *The Decisive Treatise, Determining what the Connection is between Religion and Philosophy*, in: Lerner and Mahdi, *Medieval Political Philosophy*, pp. 165–172.

AVERROES (IBN RUSHD), *Commentary on Plato’s ‘Republic’* in: *Averroes on Plato’s Republic*. Translated with an introduction and notes by Ralph Lerner (Ithaca, 2005), pp. 1–151. (E)

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

AL-TURTUSHI, *Siraj al-muluk* [‘Counsel for Kings’], chap. 11, in Marlow, *Medieval Muslim Mirrors for Princes*, pp. 203–15. (E)

Suggested secondary reading

Political Background

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

Crone, Patricia, *Slaves on Horses. The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge, 1980). (E)

Lambton, Ann K.S., ‘The Internal Structure of the Saljuq Empire’, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. V: *The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*, ed. J.A. Boyle (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 203–82. (E)

General Accounts

Black, Antony, *The History of Islamic Political Thought* (London, 2001).

Crone, Patricia, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought* (Edinburgh, 2004).

Daiber, Hans, 'Political philosophy', in *From the Greeks to the Arabs and Beyond*, 2 vols (Leiden, 2021), vol. II, pp. 90–145.

Marlow, Louis, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism in Islamic Thought* (Cambridge, 1997).

Rosenthal, E.I.J., *Political Thought in Medieval Islam: An introductory outline* (Cambridge, 1958).

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, *Interpreting Averroes. Critical essays* (Cambridge, 2018), chh. 3, 4, 12 (E), viz.:

- Akl, Ziad Bou, 'Averroes on Juridical Reasoning';
- Bouhafa, Ferial, 'Averroes' Corrective Philosophy of Law';
- Woerther, Frédérique, 'Averroes' Goals in the *Paraphrase* (Middle Commentary) of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*'.

* Crone, Patricia, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought* (Edinburgh, 2004), ch. 14. (E)

Morris, James W., 'The philosopher-prophet in Avicenna's political philosophy', in C. E. Butterworth, ed., *The Political Aspects of Islamic Philosophy: Essays in Honor of Muhsin S. Mahdi* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), ch. 4.

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

Erwin I. J. Rosenthal, 'The place of politics in the philosophy of Ibn Rushd', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 15 (1953), 246–78. (E)

———, 'The place of politics in the philosophy of Al-Farabi', *Islamic Culture*, 29 (1955), 157–78 [CUL P636.b.6].

Mirrors for Princes, Jurists

Al-Azmeh, Aziz, *Muslim Kingship: Power and the Sacred in Muslim, Christian and Pagan Polities* (London and New York, 1997; repr. 2001), part 2.

Crone, Patricia, "'Even an Ethiopian Slave'": The Transformation of a Sunnī Tradition', in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 57 (1994), 59–67. (E)

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

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

Sample Questions

1. How was political philosophy domesticated as a Muslim science?
2. How powerful a tool was reason in Islamic political thought?
3. What was the political community envisaged by Islamic philosophers?
4. What was the role of monarchy in Islamic political philosophy?
5. What roles are ascribed to religion and philosophy in the political communities envisaged by Muslim thinkers? [2024]

B13. ANIMALS, NATURE AND THE ENVIRONMENT (*Theme*)

Introduction

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

For editions of Aristotle and Augustine, see under respective A topics.

4th cent. BCE ARISTOTLE, *The Politics*, Book I, Ch. 8; *The history of animals*, I. 1.

1st-2nd cent. 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, 2023) (E – restricted terminals), or in *Plutarch: Moralia* Vol. XII (Loeb Classical Library) (E)

3rd cent. CE PORPHYRY, *On abstinence from killing animals*, tr. G. Clark (London, 2000).

4th cent. CE AUGUSTINE, *The City of God*, Bk I, Ch. 20.

1274 THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa theologiae*, I^{lae}, Q. 1, a. 1, and Q. 16, a. 1–2; I^{lae} Q. 94, a. 2, II^{lae} Q. 66, a. 1, in R. 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 wisdom*, tr. Samson Lennard, bk I, ch. 34 (EEBO).

1672 SAMUEL PUFENDORF, *On the Law of Nature and of Nations = De jure naturae et gentium*, Vol. II: *Translation* (Oxford, 1934), Bk IV, Ch. 3 (M).

- 1613 GERVASE MARKHAM, *The English husbandman*, Ch. 1, 'The proem of the author', (EEBO or [EEBO TCP](#)).
- 1625 HUGO GROTIUS, *The Rights of War and Peace*, ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis, 2005), Bk III, Ch. 12, 'Moderation with regard to spoiling', §§I–v. (E)
- 1635 GEORGE WITHER, *A Collection of Emblemes* (London, 1635), Bk I, Emblem 35: 'Posteritati' (EEBO).

Suggested Secondary Reading

Abbreviation: *Animals* = P. Adamson and G. Fay Edwards, eds, *Animals. A history* (Oxford, 2019). (E)

Antiquity

- Grumett, David, 'Aristotle's ethics and farm animal welfare', in *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 32 (2019), 321–333. (E)
- * Henry, Devin, 'Aristotle on animals', in *Animals*, Ch. 1.
- Newmyer, Stephen T., *Animals, Rights and Reason in Plutarch and Modern Ethics* (London, 2005).
- * Osborne, Catherine, *Dumb Beasts and Dead Philosophers* (Oxford, 2009), Chh. 5 and 9 (on Porphyry). (E)
- Sorabji, Richard, *Animal Minds and Human Morals* (Ithaca, NY, 1993).

Medieval Christian tradition

- Crane, Susan, *Animal Encounters. Contacts and concepts in medieval Britain* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012) (E)
- * McLaughlin, Ryan Patrick, *Christian Theology and the Status of Animals* (London, 2014), Ch. 1 'Thomas Aquinas and the dominant tradition'.
- Parel, Anthony, 'Aquinas's theory of property', in T. Flanagan and A. Parel, eds, *Theories of Property: Aristotle to the present* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1979), 55–114. (E)
- Porter, Jean, *Nature as Reason. A Thomistic theory of the natural law* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2005), Ch. 2: 'Nature as nature: The roots of natural law'.
- *Toivanen, Juhana, 'Marking the boundaries: Animals in late medieval Western philosophy', in *Animals*, Ch. 5.
- Compare: Adamson, Peter, 'Human and animal nature in the philosophy of the Islamic world', in *Animals*, Ch. 4.

Renaissance and early modern

- * Brett, Annabel, 'Use, war and commercial society: Changing paradigms of human relations with animals in the early modern law of nature and of nations', *Journal of the History of International Law*, 24 (2022), 1–35. (E)
- * Fudge, Erica, *Brutal Reasoning. Animals, rationality and humanity in early modern England* (Cornell University Press, 2006). (E)
- Muratori, Cecilia, 'Animals in the Renaissance: You eat what you are', in *Animals*, Ch. 6.

* Serjeantson, Richard W., 'The passions and animal language, 1540–1700', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 62 (2001), 425–44. (E)

* Warde, Paul, *The Invention of Sustainability. Nature and destiny c. 1500–1800* (Cambridge, 2018), esp. Ch. 1. (E)

Sample Questions

1. Were animals the 'other' of the human in the period before c.1700?
2. What values were implied by the idea of the 'natural' in the period before c.1700?
3. How did religion shape attitudes towards animals and the natural environment in the period before c.1700?
4. Did the available justifications for the killing of animals mirror those available for the killing of human beings in the period before c.1700?
5. Why did philosophers and theologians in the period to c.1700 take the question of animal capacities so seriously? [2024]

B14. MONARCHY AND REPUBLICANISM (*Theme*)

Introduction

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.

Suggested Primary Reading

- 44 BCE MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO, *On Duties*, esp. iii. [xxi.] 82–85.
 Trans. M.T. Griffin and E.M. Atkins (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 130–32.
- 55 CE LUCIUS ANNIUS SENECA, *On Mercy*, esp. i. 10–14.
 Trans. R.A. Kaster (Chicago, 2010), pp. 156–60.
-
- 1266? THOMAS AQUINAS, *On the Government of Rulers*, esp. bk i, chs 1–7.
 Trans. J.M. Blythe (Philadelphia, 1997), pp. 60–78.
- c. 1301 PTOLEMY OF LUCCA, *On the Government of Rulers*, 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, *Republics and Kingdoms Compared*, esp. bk i. 34–46.
 Trans. J. Hankins (Cambridge, MA, 2009), pp. 49–59.
- 1566 JEAN BODIN, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, ch. 6 (*part only*).
 Trans. B. Reynolds (New York, 1944; repr. 1969), pp. 267–79.
-
- 1656 JAMES HARRINGTON, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, esp. ‘The First Part of the
 Preliminaries’ (*part only*). Ed. J.G.A. Pocock (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 27–35.
- 1679/1709 JACQUES-BÉNIGNE BOSSUET, *Politics Drawn From the Very Words of Holy
 Scripture*, bk II, art. i, props 5–9. Trans. P. Riley (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 45–
 49.

Suggested Secondary Reading

General

C. Nadon, 'Republicanism: Ancient, Medieval, and Beyond', in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, ed. R.K. Balot (2009), ch. 33. (E)

Ancient Rome

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

M. Schofield, *Cicero: Political Philosophy* (2021), esp. ch. 2. (E)

* P. Stacey, *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (2007), ch. 1. (E)

Middle Ages

B. Yun, 'Ptolemy of Lucca – a pioneer of civic republicanism? A reassessment', *History of Political Thought*, 29 (2008), 417–39. (E)

* J.M. Blythe, *Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages* (1992), esp. ch. 1. (E)

A.S. Brett, 'Political philosophy', in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy*, ed. A.S. McGrade (2003), ch. 12. (E)

P. Stacey, *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (2007), ch. 2. (E)

Renaissance

* J. Hankins, 'Exclusivist republicanism and the non-monarchical republic', *Political Theory*, 20 (2010), 1–31. (E)

E. Nelson, 'The problem of the prince', in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed. J. Hankins (2007), ch. 17. (E)

Q. Skinner, 'Republican virtues in an age of princes', in *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols, vol. II: *Renaissance Virtues* (2002), ch. 5. (E)

P. Stacey, *Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince* (2007), ch. 5. (E)

Seventeenth Century

M. Dzelzainis, 'Anti-monarchism in English republicanism', in *Republicanism: A Shared European heritage*, ed. M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner, 2 vols (2002), I, pp. 27–42. (E)

J. Scott, 'Classical republicanism in seventeenth-century England and the Netherlands', in *Republicanism: A shared European heritage*, ed. M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner, 2 vols (2002), vol. I, ch. 4. (E)

Q. Skinner, 'Rethinking liberty in the English revolution', in *From Humanism to Hobbes* (2018), ch. 7. (E)

* J.P. Sommerville, 'Absolutism and royalism', in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700*, ed. J.H. Burns and M. Goldie (1991), ch. 12. (E)

Sample Questions

1. 'Theories of kingship developed in tandem with ideas of popular government.' Discuss.
2. To what extent were ideas of popular government before c. 1700 inherently anti-monarchical?
3. Did God prefer kings?
4. 'Republicanism is ... a Florentine invention' [DAVID WOOTTON]. How far do you agree?
5. To what extent did ideas of monarchy and republicanism develop in dialogue between antiquity and c.1700? [2024]

B15. OBEDIENCE AND RESISTANCE IN REFORMATION POLITICAL THOUGHT

Introduction

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 ruled out organized political resistance to unjust rulers. 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, *On Secular Authority*, ed. H. Höpfl (Cambridge, 1991) [not online].
– Alt. trans. of LUTHER, *On Secular Authority* [1523] at <https://tinyurl.com/2kffjdpd>.
– Alt. trans. of CALVIN, 'On Civil Government' (i.e. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk IV, ch. xx), trans. J. Allen <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.1058/page/n775>.
JOHN KNOX, *On Rebellion*, ed. R. Mason (Cambridge, 1994). (E)
GEORGE BUCHANAN, *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots* [written c.1569, printed 1579], trans. R. Mason and M.S. Smith (Aldershot, 2004) [not online].
FRANÇOIS HOTMAN, *Francogallia* [1573], trans. R.E. Giesey and J.H.M. Salmon (Cambridge, 1972) [not online; also <https://constitution.org/cmt/hotman/franco-gallia.htm>].
THEODORE BEZA, *The Right of Magistrates* [1574], in *Constitutionalism and Resistance in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. J.H. Franklin (New York, 1969), pp. 101–35 [not online; but see <https://www.constitution.org/cmt/beza/magistrates.htm>].
'STEPHANUS JUNIUS BRUTUS', *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos* [1579], trans. G. Garnett (Cambridge, 1994). (E)

Suggested Secondary Reading

- Abbreviation: CHPT = J.H. Burns with M. Goldie, eds, *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (1991). (E)
- J. H. Burns, 'The political thought of George Buchanan', *Scottish Historical Review*, 30 (1951), 60–68. (E)
- W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, *The Political Thought of Martin Luther* (1984).
- * M. van Gelderen, "'So meerly humane": Theories of resistance in early modern Europe', in A. Brett and J. Tully, eds, *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (2006). (E)

- * R.E. Giese, 'The monarchomach triumvirs: Hotman, Beza and Mornay', *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance*, 32 (1970). (E)
- H. Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin* (1982), chs 7, 8. (E)
- M. Jensen, *A Humanist in Reformation Politics. Philipp Melanchthon on Political Philosophy and Natural Law* (2019), esp. ch. 4. (E)
- R.M. Kingdon, 'John Calvin's contribution to representative government', in P. Mack and M.C. Jacob, eds, *Politics and Culture in Early Modern Europe* (1987), pp. 183–98. (E)
- * R.M. Kingdon, 'Calvinism and resistance theory', in *CHPT*, ch. 7. (E)
- S. Kusakawa, *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The case of Philip Melanchthon* (1995), ch. 5. (E)
- P. Matheson, 'Humanism and reform movements', in A. Goodman and A. MacKay, eds, *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe* (1990), ch. 2. (E)
- A.E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (1988), chs 5, 8. (E)
- S. Mortimer, *Reformation, Resistance and Reason of State, 1517–1625* (2021), chs 4, 10. (E)
- F. Oakley, 'Christian obedience and authority', in *CHPT*, 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, *Renaissance and Revolt* (1987). (E)
- * Q. Skinner, *Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (2 vols; 1978), vol II: *The Age of Reformation*. (E)
- , 'The origins of the Calvinist theory of revolution', in *After the Reformation*, ed. B. Malament (1980); rev. in Skinner, *Visions of Politics* (3 vols; 2002), vol. II, ch. 9. (E)
- J. Witte, *Law and Protestantism: The legal teachings of the Lutheran Reformation* (2002), ch. 4. (E)

Sample Questions

1. How important was justice in the resistance theories of the sixteenth century?
2. 'If resistance theory had any historical constant, it was the figure of the inferior magistrate.' Discuss.
3. Assess the importance of natural principles in Calvinist resistance theory.
4. What agency did Lutheran and Calvinist resistance theories give to the collective people?
5. How stable was the concept of nature in the writings of resistance theorists? [2024]

B16. REASON OF STATE

Introduction

Classical political thought, adopted and interpreted in the early renaissance, largely depended on the idea that there was no sharp break between the morality of individual virtue and the morality of governing the political community. Prudence or practical reason was common to both. Classical and early renaissance authors were by no means simple-minded about this; they had inherited from Cicero the idea that there were two goals of action, the honourable and the profitable, and from Aristotle (and indeed Plato) the idea that sometimes politics demands compromise with the not-so-desirable aspects of human behaviour. Nevertheless, in the wake of Machiavelli the idea that there might be a distinctive kind of political reason, *ragion di stato* or reason of state, discontinuous with ordinary moral reasoning, began to achieve currency. But did that discontinuity amount to contradiction? Was the new art of governing simply the self-interest of the prince, or could it still be seen as a pathway to collective human virtue? The struggle over the meaning of 'reason of state' was for contemporaries a fight for the soul of politics itself.

Suggested primary reading

JUSTUS LIPSIUS, *Politica* [1589], trans. J. Waszink (Amsterdam, 2004); or as *Sixte Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*, trans. W. Jones (London, 1594; facs. repr. 1970) (EEBO).

GIOVANNI BOTERO, *The Reason of State* [1589], 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 *Essays* [1580–95], trans. M.A. Screech (1991) [this edn not available online, but see *Essays*, 4 vols, trans. G. Ives (1925) (E)].

FRANCIS BACON, 'Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates', 'Of Empire', 'Of Simulation and Dissimulation', 'Of Seditious and Troubles', in *Essays* [1625], ed. M. Kiernen (2000) (E)

HENRI, DUC DE ROHAN, *Treatise of the Interests of the Princes and States of Christendom*, trans. H. Hunt (1640) (EEBO).

ARMAND DU PLESSIS, DUC DE RICHELIEU, *The Political Testament of Cardinal Richelieu* [1638], trans. H.B. Hill (1964) [not available online, but see *The Political Will and Testament of the Minister of State Cardinal Duke de Richelieu* (1695) (EEBO)].

Suggested secondary reading

* H. E. Braun, 'Knowledge and counsel in Giovanni Botero's *Ragion di stato*', *Journal of Jesuit Studies*, 4 (2017), 270–89. (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), ch. 4–5. (E)

- H. Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c.1540–1630* (2004), ch. 5–8. (E)
- * L. Kattenberg, *The power of necessity. Reason of state in the Spanish monarchy* (Cambridge, 2023), Intro. and ch. 1–2. (E)
- * N. Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France* (1980), chh. 4–5. (E)
- * N. Malcolm, *Reason of State, propaganda and the Thirty Years War* (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), ch. 2–7.
- * N. Millstone, 'Seeing like a statesman in early Stuart England', *Past & Present*, 223 (2014), 77–127. (E)
- M. Morford, *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition* (1993), ch. 7. (E)
- G. Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State* (1982), part 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), ch. 10.
- D. Thompson: 'Montaigne's political education: *Raison d'etat* in the *Essays*', *History of Political Thought*, 24 (2013). (E)
- R. Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (1993), ch. 2–4. (E)
- * M. Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State* (1992), ch. 4–6. (E)

Sample Questions

1. Were theorists of reason of state obsessed with the psychology of government at the expense of its structures?
2. What was the 'reason' in 'reason of state'?
3. How did reason of state theorists reconfigure the relationship between prudence and virtue?
4. How was the thinking of reason of state theorists influenced by their understanding of the purposes of the state?
5. How did reason of state theorists conceptualise political rule? [2024]

B17. SOVEREIGNTY

Introduction

The concept of sovereignty was flung to the centre-stage of European political thought with the publication, in 1576, of Jean Bodin's *Les six livres de la république* (*Six books of the commonwealth*). Here, Bodin took one of the most standard elements of contemporary political thinking – the *respublica*, the 'commonwealth' – and argued it to depend on 'sovereign power', a power unlike any other in the commonwealth. Sovereignty was absolute, indivisible and perpetual, and its possession itself identified the ruler of the political community and consequently the nature of the constitution. Very soon, everyone began to talk of the ruling power as sovereign power. And yet not everyone bought into the Bodinian construction of rule and of power which allowed that equation, nor into the triad of features (absolute, indivisible and perpetual) which for Bodin were inseparable. Accordingly, this topic looks at how a range of political thinkers negotiated the new concept of sovereignty in the context of their different understandings of political community and political rule – of commonwealth, in other words.

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 & I, *The True Law of Free Monarchies* [1598], in *Political Writings*, ed. J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge, 1994). (E)

FRANCISCO SUÁREZ, *On Laws and God the Law-giver* [1612], bk III, chh. 1–4, trans. in Francisco Suárez, *Selections from Three Works*, trans. G.L. Williams et al. (Oxford, 1944), vol. II (E); repr. ed. T. Pink (Indianapolis, 2015). (E)

Sir ROBERT FILMER, *Patriarcha* [c.1628], in *Patriarcha and Other Political Works*, ed. J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge, 1991). (E)

HUGO GROTIUS, *The Law of War and Peace* [1625], bk I, ch. 3–4. Trans. F.W. Kelsey (3 vols; Oxford, 1913), vol. I, pp. 91–163 (E) [at HeinOnline.org]; or ed. R. Tuck as *The Rights of War and Peace* (Indianapolis, 2005), vol. I, pp. 240–383. (E)

THOMAS HOBBS, *On the Citizen* [1642, 1647], ed. R. Tuck and M. Silverthorne (Cambridge, 1998), ch. 6 [not online; but the defective Cotton translation, ed. H. Warrender (1983) is (E)].

THOMAS HOBBS, *Leviathan* [1651], ed. R. Tuck (Cambridge, 1996), chh. 16–18 [not online; see A7 Hobbes for details on N. Malcolm edition (E)].

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation: CHPT = J.H. Burns with M. Goldie, eds, *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (1991) (E)

- D. Baumgold, *Contract Theory in Historical Context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke* (2010), chs 2 and 4.
- * A. Brett, 'Political thought', in H. Scott, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern European History*, vol. II: *Cultures and Power* (2015), ch. 2. (E)
- , 'The subject of sovereignty. Law, politics and moral reasoning in Hugo Grotius', *Modern Intellectual History*, 17 (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)
- M. Goldie, 'Absolutism', in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Political Philosophy*, ed. George Klosko (2011), pp. 282–93. (E)
- * K. Hoekstra, 'Early modern absolutism and constitutionalism', *Cardozo Law Review*, 34 (2013), 1079–98. (E)
- H. Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought* (2004), chs. 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)
- , 'Bodin and the Monarchomachs', in *Renaissance and Revolt* (1987), ch. 5. (E)
- * Q. Skinner, 'A genealogy of the modern state', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 162 (2009), 325–70 (E); abbrev. version publ. as 'The sovereign state: a genealogy', in *Sovereignty in Fragments*, ed. H. Kalmo and Q. Skinner (2014), ch. 1. (E)
- J.P. Sommerville, 'James I and the divine right of kings: English politics and continental theory', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. L.L. Peck (1991), ch. 4.
- , *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*, ch. 12. (E)
- R. Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (1992), ch. 5. (E)
- * ———, *The Sleeping Sovereign* (2016), esp. chs 1–2. (E)
- , 'Democratic sovereignty and democratic government: the sleeping sovereign', in *Popular Sovereignty in Historical Perspective*, ed. R. Bourke and Q. Skinner (2016), ch. 5. (E)
- S. Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (2010). (E)

For further reading on Hobbes see under A7.

Sample Questions

1. 'Early modern theories of sovereignty were unable to exit the orbit of absolute monarchy.' Discuss.
2. Why was Grotius so exceptional among early modern theorists of sovereignty in holding that sovereign power could be divided?

3. What space, if any, did early modern theories of sovereignty leave for political actors other than the sovereign?

4. Why were early modern theorists of sovereignty so concerned to characterise as incoherent any notion of 'mixed' government?

5. Did early modern theorists of sovereignty leave any room for the citizen as distinct from the subject? [2024]

B18. POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE BRITISH REVOLUTIONS, 1640–50

Introduction

The breakdown in relations between king Charles I and the two Houses of Parliament that led to the outbreak of Civil War in England after August 1642 was paralleled by an extraordinary efflorescence of political theory debating some key questions that addressed and shaped these events. What is the origin of political power? What are the rights of kings, and do they derive immediately from God? Is armed resistance to a sovereign ever justifiable, and if so in what circumstances? Does sovereignty lie with the monarch, or with the people, or with their representatives in parliament? And what are the claims of a people in relation to their rulers? In these English debates the ideas of Scottish Presbyterians, such as Samuel Rutherford, also played a significant role. As Parliament gained the upper hand from 1646 it was itself challenged by those known (derogatorily) as ‘Levellers’, who sought to extend the new political opportunities that had been won by the New Model Army from which many of them sprang. Finally, the execution of Charles I and the founding of the republican English Commonwealth in 1649 generated a further body of literature justifying these epoch-making events.

Suggested primary reading

The first civil war

HENRY PARKER, *Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses* (July 1642) ([EEBO](#)). [Annotated edition also [available on the course Moodle site.](#)]

HENRY PARKER, *Jus populi* (1644) ([EEBO](#)).

SAMUEL RUTHERFORD, *Lex, Rex: The Law and the Prince* (1644), questions I–IX, XXI–XXV, XXVIII–XXIX ([EEBO](#)).

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’ [1649/50], pp. 3–48 (this edition is unavailable online, but the original first and second editions are reproduced on [EEBO](#)).

MARCHAMONT NEDHAM, ‘A Discourse of the Excellency of a Free-State’, in his *The Case of the Commonwealth of England Stated* (1650), pt II, ch. 5, pp. 80–94 ([EEBO](#)). [Note that the treatise by Nedham from 1656 with a similar title, edited by Blair Worden (Indianapolis, 2011), is a different text.]

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviations:

CHMPT = J. H. Burns with M. Goldie, eds, *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991). (E)

Milton and Republicanism = D. Armitage, A. Himy and Q. Skinner, eds, *Milton and Republicanism* (Cambridge, 1995). (E)

Democracy and Anti-Democracy = C. Cuttica and M. Peltonen, eds, *Democracy and Anti-Democracy in Early Modern England 1603–1689* (Leiden, 2019). (E)

The civil wars

* J. Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, 1997), ch. 6. (E)

A. Cromartie, 'Parliamentary sovereignty, popular sovereignty, and Henry Parker's adjudicative standpoint', in *Popular Sovereignty in Historical Perspective*, ed. R. Bourke and Q. Skinner (Cambridge, 2016), 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* (Cambridge, 1994), ch. 11. (E)

* M. Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1995). (E)

* M. Mendle, 'Parliamentary sovereignty: A very English absolutism', in N. Phillipson and Q. Skinner, ed., *Political discourse in early modern Britain* (Cambridge, 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. (E)

Levellers

R. Foxley, 'Imagining citizenship in the Levellers and Milton', in *Democracy and Anti-Democracy*, 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 & 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* (London, 1972).

* D. Wootton, 'Leveller democracy and the Puritan revolution', in CHMPT, ch. 14. (E)

Republicanism

M. Dzelzainis, 'Milton's classical republicanism', in *Milton and republicanism*, ch. 1. (E)

* P. Hammond, *Milton and the People* (2014), ch. 6. (E)

M. Peltonen, "'All government is in the people, from the people, and for the people": democracy in the English revolution', in *Democracy and Anti-Democracy*, ch. 3. (E)

———, *The Political Thought of the English Free State* (Cambridge, 2022). (E)

- L. Sabbadini, 'Popular sovereignty and representation in the English civil war', in *Popular Sovereignty in Historical Perspective*, ed. R. Bourke and Q. Skinner (Cambridge, 2016), ch. 7. (E)
- Q. Skinner, 'Rethinking liberty in the English revolution', in *From Humanism to Hobbes* (Cambridge, 2018), ch. 7. (E)
- , *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1998). (E)
- , *Hobbes and Republican Liberty* (Cambridge, 2008).
- * B. Worden, 'English republicanism', in *CHMPT*, ch. 15. (E)
- * ———, 'Milton and Marchamont Nedham', in *Milton and Republicanism*, ch. 9. (E)

Sample Questions

1. In what ways did political writers of the British civil wars counter the royalist claim that kingly power came directly from God?
2. 'No right of rebellion was articulated in the British civil wars. Theorists of resistance held that rebellion was what tyrants were guilty of.' Discuss.
3. 'Power is originally inherent in the people' [HENRY PARKER, *Observations upon some of his Majesties late Answers and Expresses*]. How far did defenders of the Parliamentary cause face up to the implications of this claim?
4. Examine the role of the concept of 'mixed polity' in the political thought of the British civil wars.
5. Did arguments against royal absolutism privilege the power of the body politic over the liberty of its individual members? [2024]

B19. GENDER AND POLITICAL THOUGHT (*Theme*)

Introduction

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, liberty and equality. Questions for this topic will allow students to focus on any two periods (Antiquity; Middle Ages; Renaissance; Early modern) if they wish, although they will equally allow students to offer answers covering the entire chronological range of the topic.

Suggested Primary Reading

For editions of Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli and Hobbes see under respective A topics

4th cent. BCE PLATO, *The Republic*, Book IV, 449a–466e.

4th cent. BCE ARISTOTLE, *The Politics*, Book I, Chh. 12–13; *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VIII

1st-2nd cent. CE PLUTARCH, *Advice to a bride and groom* and *Consolation to his wife*, ed. and tr. Sarah Pomeroy (New York, 1999). (E)

1405 CHRISTINE DE PISAN, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, ed. Rosalind Brown-Grant (Penguin, 1999), Book I, Chapters 1-9, 11, 14, 27, 33, 43; Book II, Chapters 12, 36, 53, 69; Book III, Chapters 1, 3, 18-19 (E – library terminals).

1516 THOMAS MORE, *Utopia*, ed. and tr. G.M. Logan and R.M. Adams (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 43-58, 79-81

1525 NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI, *Clizia*, tr. Daniel T. Gallagher (Long Grove, IL, 1996); *The prince*, Ch. 25; *Discourses on Livy*, III.6.

1540 THOMAS ELYOT, *The Defence of Good Women*, in Robert Sullivan and Arthur E. Walzer, eds, *Thomas Elyot: Critical edition of four works of counsel* (Leiden, 2018), Ch. 10. (E)

1588 JOHN CASE, *The Sphere of the City*, tr. Dana Sutton), Book I, Ch. 1 (The chapter's doubtful question), Ch. 3 (The distinction of the 4th question), Ch. 8. <https://philological.cal.bham.ac.uk/sphaera/>

1589 JUSTUS LIPSIUS, *Politica. Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction*, ed. J. Waszink (Assen, 2004), Book II, Ch. 3.

- 1651 THOMAS HOBBS, *Leviathan*, Ch. 20 'Of dominion paternall and despoticall'.
- 1654 ARCANGELA TARABOTTI, *Paternal tyranny*, ed. and tr. Letizia Panizza (Chicago, 2004), Dedication; Book I pp.43-6, 48-51,60-4, 67-9, 79-81; Book II pp. 94-5, 99-101. (E)
- 1668 MARGARET CAVENDISH, *The Blazing World*, in *Political Writings*, ed. Susan James (Cambridge, 2003), 'To the reader'; Part I pp.7-15, 19-21, 48-50, 67-89; Part II pp.94-101; Epilogue. (E)

Suggested Secondary Reading

Antiquity

- Beneker, Jeffrey, *The Passionate Statesman. Erōs and politics in Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford, 2012), Ch. 1: 'Erōs and marriage'. (E)
- Gartner, Corinne A., 'Aristotle on love and friendship', in C. Bobonich ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Ethics* (Cambridge, 2017), Ch. 8 (E)
- Salkever, Steven, *Finding the Mean. Theory and practice in Aristotle's Politics* (Princeton 1990), ch. 4: 'Plato and Aristotle on the politics of virility'. (E)
- Sheffield, Frisbee, 'Plato on love and friendship', in C. Bobonich ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Ethics* (Cambridge, 2017), Ch. 5 (E)

Middle Ages

- Brown-Grant, Rosalind, *Christine de Pisan and the moral defence of women: Reading beyond gender* (Cambridge 2004), esp. Ch. 4. (E)
- Forhan, Kate Langdon, *The Political Theory of Christine de Pisan* (Aldershot 2002), esp. Ch. 3 and 5
- 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. (E)

Renaissance

- * Becker, Anna, *Gendering the Renaissance Commonwealth* (Cambridge, 2021). (E)
- Dauber, Noah, *State and Commonwealth* (Princeton, 2016), Ch. 3 'The monarchical republic' on John Case (not specifically on gender, but good analysis of his political thought).
- Hairston, Julia, 'Skirting the issue: Machiavelli's Caterina Sforza', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53/3 (2000), 687–212. (E)
- Jordan, Constance, 'Feminism and the humanists: the case of Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women*', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 36 (1983), 181–201. (E)
- Pitkin, Hanna, *Fortune is a woman. Gender and politics in the thought of Niccolò Machiavelli* (Chicago, 1999)
- Sullivan, Robert, 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'. (E)

Vilches, Patricia, and Gerald Seaman, eds, *Seeking Real Truths: Multidisciplinary perspectives on Machiavelli* (Leiden, 2007), Section 2: *Society* (six chapters that all address gender in different ways, including in *Clizia* and Machiavelli's other plays). (E)

Seventeenth Century

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

Boyle, Deborah, 'Fame, virtue and government: Margaret Cavendish on ethics and politics', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67/2 (2006), 251-290. (E)

Boyle, Deborah, 'Margaret Cavendish on gender, nature and freedom', *Hypatia* 28/3 (2013), 516-532. (E)

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) (Special issue on 'Women and radical thought in the early modern period'), 7–26. (E)

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

Sample Questions

1. To what extent was marriage understood as a political relationship in the period to c.1700? Answer with reference to **any two or more** of the periods you have studied.
2. How did political thinkers in the period to c.1700 square the subordinate position of women with their investment in the political values of liberty and equality? Answer with reference to **any two or more** of the periods you have studied.
3. Did the construction of female virtue simply underpin the rule of men in the period to c.1700? Answer with reference to **any two or more** of the periods you have studied.
4. How did thinkers in the period to c.1700 invoke nature in relation to arguments about women? Answer with reference to **any two or more** of the periods you have studied.
5. Did arguments for women's virtue simply confirm their political marginalisation? Answer with reference to any **two or more** of the periods: Ancient; Medieval; Renaissance; Early Modern. [2024]

B20. COLONIAL EMPIRE (*Theme*)

Introduction

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, 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. (E)
- 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. (E)
- 1539 FRANCISCO DE VITORIA, ‘On the American Indians’, esp. qu. 3 (part). In *Political Writings*, trans. J. Lawrence (Cambridge, 1991), esp. pp. 277–92. (E)
- 1588 GIOVANNI BOTERO, *On the Causes of the Greatness and Magnificence of Cities*, bk ii, chs 1–3. Trans. G. Symcox (Toronto, 2012), pp. 31–34. (E)
- 1625 FRANCIS BACON, ‘Of the true greatness of kingdoms and estates’ and ‘Of plantations’. In *The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall*, ed. M. Kiernan (Oxford, 2000), 89–99, 106–08. (E)
- 1656 JAMES HARRINGTON, ‘The Introduction or Order of the Work’, in *Oceana*. Ed. J.G.A. Pocock (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 3–7. (E)
- 1682/9 JOHN LOCKE, *Two Treatises of Government*, Second Treatise, ch. 5. Ed. M. Goldie (Oxford, 2016), pp. 14–26 (E) or many other editions.

Secondary reading

- * A. Anghie, ‘Francisco de Vitoria and the colonial origins of international law’, *Social & Legal Studies*, 5 (1996), 321–36. (E) Repr. in Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* (2005), ch. 1. (E)

- D. Armitage, 'Literature and empire', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. I: *The Origins of Empire*, ed. Nicholas Canny (1998), 99–123. (E)
- , *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (2000). (E)
- . 'John Locke, Carolina and the *Two Treatises of Government*', *Political Theory*, 32 (2004), 602–27. (E)
- * ———, 'John Locke: theorist of empire', in *Empire and Modern Political Thought*, ed. S. Muthu (2012), pp. 84–111 (E); repr. in Armitage, *The Foundations of Modern International Thought* (2013), pp. 114–32. (E)
- A.S. Brett, *Changes of State: Nature and the limits of the city in early modern natural law* (2011), esp. ch. 8. (E)
- N. Canny, 'The Ideology of English colonization: From Ireland to America', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 30 (1973), 575–98. (E)
- , *Making Ireland British 1580–1650* (2001), esp. chs. 1, 3, 4. (E)
- M.T. Clarke, 'Uprooting Nebuchadnezzar's tree: Francis Bacon's criticism of Machiavellian imperialism', *Political Research Quarterly*, 61 (2008), 367–78. (E)
- J.H. Elliott, 'A Europe of composite monarchies', *Past & Present*, 137 (1992), 48–71. (E)
- A. Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America: An intellectual history of English colonization, 1500–1625* (2003). (E)
- * ———, et al., 'The intellectual history of early modern empire', *Renaissance Studies*, 26 (2012), 479–604, esp. the Introduction, pp. 479–90. (E)
- M. Hörnqvist, *Machiavelli and Empire* (2004). (E)
- D. Ivison, 'The nature of rights and the history of empire', in *British Political Thought in History, Literature, and Theory, 1500–1800*, ed. D. Armitage (2006), 191–211. (E)
- A. Pagden, 'Dispossessing the barbarian: the language of Spanish Thomism and the debate over the property rights of the American Indians', in *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*, ed. A. Pagden (1987), 79–98. (E)
- * ———, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France, c.1500–c.1800* (1995), esp. chs. 1, 5. (E)
- , 'The Struggle for legitimacy and the image of empire in the Atlantic to c.1700', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. I, ed. N. Canny (1998), 34–54. (E)
- M. Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570–1640* (1995), ch. 4. (E)
- D.B. Quinn, 'Renaissance influences in English colonisation', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), 73–93. (E)
- P.J. Stern, *The Company-State: Corporate sovereignty and the early modern foundations of the British Empire in India* (2011), esp. intro. and ch. 4. (E)
- N. Vance, 'Imperial Rome and Britain's language of empire 1600–1837', *History of European Ideas*, 26, (2000), 211–24. (E)
- * S. Zeitlin, 'Francis Bacon on imperial and colonial warfare', *The Review of Politics*, 83 (2021), 196–218. (E)

Sample Questions

1. 'From the early seventeenth century onwards a view of colonisation arose that accommodated a martial and Roman understanding of empire to one that emphasised commerce and interest'. How far do you agree?
2. To what extent did a Machiavellian vision of colonial expansion dominate European thinking on empire across the early modern period?
3. How far was European imperial expansion legitimated by appeals to religion?
4. What motives led early modern Europeans to justify (or criticise) the fact of their colonial expansions?
5. Which ideology was more significant in justifying European colonialism before c.1700: Christian religion or Roman imperialism? [2024]

Appendix: Examiners' Reports

Examiners' reports for Part II papers, including POL7, can be found on the POLIS website: [Second Year Students | Department of Politics and International Studies \(POLIS\) \(cam.ac.uk\)](#).

Past Papers can be found here: [Course: History Undergraduate Exams: Past Papers and Reports | Moodle \(cam.ac.uk\)](#) . For POL7, follow the link to Part IB and select T1 (the History Faculty's designation for the paper). Questions from the 2023-24 exam paper have been integrated into this guide in the suggested supervision questions appended to the reading lists.

N.B. Reports prior to 2023-4 refer to an older syllabus, which differed in detail from the current syllabus. Reflecting the changes, the History Faculty has removed online access to past papers from before 2023-4. Those interested should still be able to consult them in hard copy through the Cambridge Library System.