1. Introduction to the History of Political Thought Papers:

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

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

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

3. Structure of the Paper

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

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

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

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

SECTION A

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

SECTION B

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

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

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

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

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

5. Lectures

**Michaelmas Term**

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

Other lectures will take place in the History Faculty.

**Tuesdays at 9**

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

**Wednesdays at 9**

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

Tuesdays at 9
- More, Machiavelli, republicanism and monarchy (4 lectures, Richard Serjeantson)
- Hobbes, sovereignty, and reason of state (4 lectures, Annabel Brett)

Wednesdays at 9
- Obedience and resistance from the Reformation to the British civil wars
  (4 lectures, Magnus Ryan and Annabel Brett)
- Locke (2 lectures, Annabel Brett)
- Colonialism (2 lectures, Richard Serjeantson)

Easter Term

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

6. The Examination

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

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

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

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

7. Reading Lists

Notes

(E) = Available via iDiscover

* = either a good introductory treatment or a distinctive interpretative lens that is helpful for thinking.
A1. PLATO

Set text


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

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation:


A. Laks, ‘The Laws’ in CHGRPT, ch. 12 (E)


*M. Lane, ‘Socrates and Plato: an introduction’, in CHGRPT, ch. 8 (E)

_____, Greek and Roman Political Ideas (Pelican 2014); available online in its American edition under the title, The Birth of Politics: Eight Greek and Roman political ideas and why they matter, (2015) (E)


C.D.C. Reeve, Philosopher Kings (1988)

*M. Schofield, ‘Approaching the Republic’, in CHGRPT, ch. 10 (E)


*B. Williams, ‘The analogy of city and soul in Plato’s Republic’ in E.N. Lee, ed., Exegesis and Argument (1973) [in Classics Faculty Library]

A2. ARISTOTLE

Set texts


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)


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

Abbreviations:

J. Annas, The Morality of Happiness (1993), sections on Aristotle (E)
M.F. Burnyeat, ‘Aristotle on learning to be good’, in Rorty, ch. 5
J. Frank, A democracy of distinction (Chicago 2005)
*J. Lear, Aristotle: The Desire to Understand (1988) (E)
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 his Saving the City (1999), ch. 6

A3. AUGUSTINE

Set text

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

Suggested secondary reading

———, Augustine of Hippo (1967)
H. Chadwick, The Early Church (1967), ch. 15
———, Augustine (1986) (E)
P. Garnsey, Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine, chs 13-14
*R.A. Markus, Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine (1970) (E)
P. Ramsey, ‘The just war according to St Augustine’ in J.B. Elshtain, ed., Just War Theory (1992)
*J. Wetzel ed., *Augustine’s ‘City of God’: A critical guide* (Cambridge 2012) (E)

**A.4 MARSILIUS OF PADUA**

**Set text**


These editions are not available online via iDiscover

**Suggested secondary reading**

**Abbreviations:**


Brett, Annabel, ‘Issues in translating the *Defensor pacis*’, in Moreno-Riaño, pp. 91-108
Brett, Annabel, ‘Politics, right(s) and human freedom’ in V. Mäkinen and P. Korkmann eds., *Transformations in medieval and early modern rights discourse* (Dordrecht 2006), pp. 95-117
Lambertini, Roberto, ‘Marsilius and the poverty controversy in Dictio II’, in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman, pp. 229-263
Lambertini, Roberto, ‘Marsilius as a reader of Aristotle’s *Politica*’, in Mulieri et al., pp.
Nederman, Cary, *Community and consent. The secular political theory of Marsiglio of Padua’s Defensor pacis* (Lanham MD 1995)
Shogimen, Takashi, ‘Medicine and the body politic in Marsilius of Padua’s *Defensor pacis’, in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman, pp. 71-115

**A5. MORE**

**Set text:**

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

**Suggested secondary reading**

A. Fox, *Thomas More: History and Providence* (1982), ch. 2
J. Paul, *Thomas More* (2017), Ch. 2

**A6. MACHIAVELLI**

**Set texts**


**Suggested secondary reading**


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 edn) (E)
W. Hanasz, ‘The common good in Machiavelli’, *History of Political Thought* 31 (2010), 57-85 (E)
M. Hörnqvist, *Machiavelli and Empire* (2005), chs 2-4 (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; reissue with new postscript 2003), esp. pt II (E)


———, ‘The theme of gloria in Machiavelli’, Renaissance Quarterly, 30 (1977), 588-631

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

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


* ———, ‘Machiavelli’s Discorsi and the pre-humanist origin of republican ideas’, in Bock, 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 (Cambridge 2007) (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 Bock, ch. 7 (E)

———, Machiavelli (1998) (E)

M. Viroli, From Politics to Reason of State (1992) (E)

A7. HOBBES

Set text

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:


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)


* 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)


* ———, Hobbes and republican liberty (Cambridge 2008)


T. Sorell, Hobbes (1986), esp. chs 1-2, 8-10
*Political Discourse in early modern Britain* (1993), pp. 120-38 (E)
Tully eds., *Rethinking the foundations of modern political thought* (Cambridge 2006) (E)

**A8. LOCKE**

**Set texts**

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


**Suggested secondary reading**

R. Ashcraft, ‘Revolutionary politics and Locke’s Two Treatises’, *Political Theory*, 8 (1980), 429-86 (E)
J. Dunn, ‘What is living and what is dead in the political theory of John Locke?’, in Dunn,
*Interpreting Political Responsibility* (1990) (E)
M. Goldie, ‘John Locke and Anglican Royalism’, *Political Studies*, 31 (1983), 61-85 (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)
*———, An Approach to Political Theory: Locke in Contexts* (1993), esp. ch. 1 (E)

**B9. SLAVERY (Theme)**

Slavery, the ownership of one human being by another, was an accepted feature of Greco-Roman political
society and subsequently legitimated in Christian (and other) thought until well beyond the period covered
by this paper. This topic covers a range of philosophical and theological discussions of slavery from antiquity
to the early modern period. Only the Capuchin friar Epifanio de Moirans, writing in Cuba at the end of the
seventeenth century, argues for abolition, although many others recognise at least some immorality or
inhumanity in what they are legitimating and argue for modifications. Nearly all of them agree that enslavement of enemies in a just war is legitimate but is not practised by Christians among themselves, situating the 16th and 17th century discussion squarely within an extra-European and imperial context.

**Suggested Primary Reading**

- **4th C. BCE**
  - Aristotle, *The Politics*, Book I, Chh. 3-7

- **1st C. CE**
    - Vol. 75, Epistle 47, pp. 301-313
  - St Paul, 1 Corinthians 7.20-24; Colossians 3.22

- **4th C. CE**
  - Augustine, *The City of God*, Book XIX, Ch. 15 and 16

- **1274**
  - Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologicae*, Ia Q. 96 a. 3 and a. 4;
    - Iallae Q. 104 a. 5 and a.6, in Robert Dyson ed., *Aquinas, Political Writings* (Cambridge 2002), pp. 1-4; pp. 68-71

- **1539**

- **1625**
  - Hugo Grotius, *The rights of war and peace*, ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis 2005), Book II, Ch. 5 ‘Acquisition of a right over persons’, Sections XXVI-XXX; Book II, Ch. 22 ‘Unjust causes of war’, Sections XI-XII; Book III, Ch. 7 ‘Of the right over prisoners’ (full chapter) (E)

- **1681**
  - John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, Ch. 4 ‘Of Slavery’;
    - Ch. 11, ‘Of conquest’, §§ 177-18

**Suggested Secondary Reading**

**Antiquity**

- Agamben, Giorgio, *The Use of Bodies*, Ch. 1, in *The Omnibus Homo Sacer* (Stanford 2017), pp. 1029-1048 (E)
- Timothy Brookins, ‘(Dis)correspondence of Paul and Seneca on slavery’, in J. Dodson and D. Briones eds., *Paul and Seneca in dialogue* (Leiden 2017), pp. 179-207 (E)
- Garnsey, Peter, *Ideas of slavery from Aristotle to Augustine* (Cambridge 1996)

**Thomas Aquinas and the 16th- and 17th-century debate among Catholic theologians**

- Cornish, Paul J., ‘Marriage, slavery and natural rights in the political thought of Aquinas’, *The Review of Politics*, 60(3) (1998), 545-562 (E)
- Hofmeister Pich, Roberto, ‘Francisco José de Jaca’s (c. 1645–1689) and Epifanio de Moirans’s (1644–1689) plea for the liberation of enslaved black people in Latin America’, in C. Müller et al. eds., *Civilization – Nature – Subjugation: Variations of (De-)Colonization* (Frankfurt 2021)
Ireton, Chloe, ‘Black Africans’ freedom litigation suits to define just war and just slavery in the early Spanish empire’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 73 (2020), 1277-319 (E)


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 Chh. 6 and 9 in the same volume) (E)


**Slavery and war in the seventeenth century**

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 (1) (2001), 197-231 (E)

Stelder, Mikki, ‘The colonial difference in Hugo Grotius: rational man, slavery and indigenous dispossession’, *Postcolonial Studies* 25(4) (2022), 564-583 (E)


**B10. EARLY CHRISTIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT**

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

*Suggested primary reading*

The Epistle of St Paul 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, 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)]

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

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation:

A. Cameron, Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: the Development of Christian Discourse (Berkeley, 1991) (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)

N. McLynn, Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital (Berkeley, London, 1994) (E)

And see above, A3, under Augustine.

B11. TEMPORAL AND SPIRITUAL IN MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THOUGHT

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

Suggested primary reading

Bernard of Clairvaux, Five Books on Consideration, trans. J.D. Anderson and E.T. Keenan (Cistercian Fathers Series 37) (Kalamazoo, 1976) [not online, but see trans. by G. Lewis (1908) at https://archive.org/details/bernardsdeclirvau00bernuoft/page/n4/mode/2up ]
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].


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]


Suggested secondary reading

Abbrivation:

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


* B. Tierney, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory (Cambridge, 1955) (E)

B. Tierney, Crisis, 127-31; 150-53.


* 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)


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


B12. Medieval Islamic political thought

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

Avicenna, On the Divisions of the Rational Sciences
Averroes, The Decisive Treatise, Determining what the Connection is between Religion and Philosophy, in: Lerner and Mahdi, Medieval Political Philosophy, pp. 165-172.
   Al-Turtushi, Siraj al-muluk ['Counsel for Kings'], chap. 11, in Marlow, Medieval Muslim Mirrors for Princes, pp. 203-15. (E)

Suggested secondary reading

1. Political Background

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

2. General Accounts

   Black, Antony, The history of Islamic political thought (London: Routledge, 2001)
   Crone, Patricia, Medieval Islamic Political Thought (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004)
   Marlow, Louis, Hierarchy and Egalitarianism in Islamic Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

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

   In addition to the introductions by the editors and translators, see:
4. Mirrors for Princes, Jurists


Marlow, Louise, ‘Introduction’ in Medieval Muslim Mirrors for Princes (E)

B13. Animals and the natural environment (Theme)

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

Suggested Primary Reading

4th c. BCE

- Aristotle, The Politics, Book I, Ch. 8; The history of animals, I. 1

1st–2nd c. CE

- Plutarch, On the cleverness of animals, Whether beasts are rational and On eating meat, in Stephen T. Newmyer, Plutarch’s Three Treatises on Animals (London: Routledge, 2023)

3rd c. CE

- Porphyry, On abstinence from killing animals, tr. Gillian Clark (London 2000)

4th c. CE

- Augustine, The City of God, Bk I, Ch. 20

1274


1569


1608

- Pierre Charron, Of wisedome, tr. Samson Lennard, Book I, Ch. 34

1613 Gervase Markham, The English husbandman
1625 Hugo Grotius, The rights of war and peace, ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis 2005), Lib. III, Cap. XII, ‘Moderation with regard to spoiling’, Sections I-V
1635 George Wither, A Collection of Emblemes (London 1635), Book I, Emblem 35 ‘Posteritati’

Suggested Secondary Reading

Abbreviation:

Antiquity

Henry, Devin, ‘Aristotle on animals’, in Animals, Ch. 1
Newmyer, Stephen T., Animals, rights and reason in Plutarch and modern ethics (London: Routledge, 2005)
Osborne, Catherine, Dumb beasts and dead philosophers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
Sorabji, Richard, Animal minds and human morals (Cornell University Press, 1993)

Medieval Christian tradition

Porter, Jean, A Thomistic theory 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

Muratori, Cecilia, ‘Animals in the Renaissance: You eat what you are’, in Animals, Ch. 6
B14. Monarchy and Republicanism (Theme)

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

Indicative Primary Reading


Suggested Secondary Reading

General


Ancient Rome


Stacey, Peter, Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince (Cambridge, 2007), esp. ch. 1.
B15. OBEDIENCE AND RESISTANCE IN REFORMATION POLITICAL THOUGHT

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

Suggested primary reading


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 available online]

François Hotman, Francogallia [1573], trans. R.E. Giesey and J.H.M. Salmon (Cambridge, 1972) [not available online through the UL; see alternatively, https://constitution.org/cmt/hotman/franco-gallia.htm]


**Abbreviation:**

J. H. Burns, ‘The political thought of George Buchanan’, *Scottish Historical Review*, 30 (1951), 60-8 (E)


* R.M. Kingdon, ‘Calvinism and resistance theory’, in Burns and Goldie, ch. 7 (E)

S. Kusukawa, *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melanchthon* (1995), ch. 5 (E)


A.E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (1988), chs 5, 8 (E)


F. Oakley, ‘Christian obedience and authority’, in Burns and Goldie, ch. 6 (E)


### B16. REASON OF STATE

**Suggested primary reading:**


Henri, duc de Rohan, *Treatise of the Interests of the Princes and States of Christendom*, trans. H. Hunt (1640) [on EEBO (E)]

Armand du Plessis, duc de Richelieu, *The Political Testament of Cardinal Richelieu*, 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) [on EEBO (E)]]
Suggested secondary reading


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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

B17. SOVEREIGNTY

Suggested primary reading


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

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


Thomas Hobbes, On the citizen, ed. R. Tuck and M. Silverthorne (Cambridge 1998), ch. 6; [not available online; the defective Cotton translation as edited by H. Warrender (1983) is available (E)].

Leviathan, ed. R. Tuck (Cambridge 1996), chh. 16-18 [see A7 Hobbes for details on N. Malcom edition, available online]
Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation:

J.H. Franklin, ‘Sovereignty and the mixed constitution: Bodin and his critics’, in CHPT, ch. 10 (E)
H. Höpfl, *Jesuit political thought* (2004), chh. 9. 10, 13, 14 (E)
J.H.M. Salmon, ‘Catholic resistance theory, Ultramontanism and the royalist response’, in CHPT Ch. 8 (E)
———, ‘The legacy of Jean Bodin: absolutism, populism or constitutionalism’, *History of Political Thought*, 17 (1996), 500-22. (E)
———, *Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context* (1992), Ch. 4-5
———, ‘From Suarez to Filmer’, *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), 525-40 (E)
———, ‘Absolutism and royalism’, in CHPT (E)
R. Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, 1572-1651 (1992), Ch. 5 (E)
———, *The sleeping sovereign* (Cambridge 2016) (E)

For further reading on Hobbes see under A7

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

Suggested primary reading

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

Henry Parker, *Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses* (1642). An annotated edition of this text is available on the course Moodle site
[https://www.vle.cam.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=91091&section=13](https://www.vle.cam.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=91091&section=13)

Henry Parker, *Jus populi* (1644)

Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, rex: The Law and the Prince* (1644); questions I-IX, XXI-XXV, XXVIII-XXIX.

*The Levellers*

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

John Milton, Political Writings, ed. M. Dzelzainis (Cambridge, 1991), esp. ‘The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates’ [1649] (pp. 3-48) [unavailable online, but for 1649 edition of ‘The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates’, see EEBO (E)].


Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation

The civil wars

* John Coffey, Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The mind of Samuel Rutherford (1997), ch. 6 (E)
R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1993), ch. 6

Levellers

*D. Wootton, ‘Leveller democracy and the Puritan revolution’, in CHMPT

Republicanism

M. Dzelzainis, ‘Milton’s classical republicanism’, in Milton and republicanism
*Paul Hammond, Milton and the People (2014), ch. 6 (E).
B19. The politics of gender (Theme)

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

Suggested Primary Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author, Title, Edition and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th BCE</td>
<td>Aristotle, <em>The Politics</em>, Book I; <em>Nicomachean Ethics</em>, Book VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd CE</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Moralia: Advice to a bride and groom</em> and <em>Dialogue on love</em> (Loeb Classical Library).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Niccolò Machiavelli, <em>Clizia</em>, tr. Daniel T. Gallagher (Long Grove, IL 1996); <em>The prince and Discourses on Livy</em> (pp. on fortune; Caterina Sforza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>John Case, <em>The Sphere of the City</em>, tr. Dana Sutton (online link), Book I, Ch. 1 (The chapter’s doubtful question), Ch. 3 (The distinction of the 4th question), Ch. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Justus Lipsius, <em>Politica. Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction</em>, ed. J. Waszink (Assen 2004), Book II, Ch. 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Secondary Reading

Antiquity


Salkever, Steven, *Finding the mean. Theory and practice in Aristotle’s Politics*, Ch. 4: ‘Plato and Aristotle on the politics of virility’
Middle Ages

Brown-Grant, Rosalind, Christine de Pisan and the moral defence of women: Reading beyond gender (Cambridge 2004)
Forhan, Kate Langdon, The political theory of Christine de Pisan (Aldershot 2002)
Hult, David F., ‘The Roman de la rose, Christine de Pisan and the querelle des femmes’ in C. Dinshaw and D. Wallace eds., The Cambridge companion to medieval women’s writing (Cambridge 1993), pp. 184-194

Renaissance

Becker, Anna, Gendering the renaissance commonwealth (Cambridge 2021), esp. pp. CHECK
Ebbersmeyer, Sabrina, ‘Humanism and feminism. Some remarks on a difficult relationship’ Rinascimento n.s, LX (2020), 373-389
Pitkin, Hannah Fenichel, Fortune is a woman

Seventeenth Century

Ebbersmeyer, Sabrina, “‘There remains nothing to lose for the one who has lost liberty’: Liberty and free will in Arcangela Tarabotti’s (1604-1652) radical criticism of the patriarchy’, Intellectual History Review 31/1 (2021), 7-26
Hirschmann, Nancy J., and Wright, Joanne, eds., Feminist interpretations of Thomas Hobbes (Philadelphia 2012), esp. chh. 2, 5 and 6, 7

B20. Colonial Empire (Theme)

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

Suggested primary reading


1625 Francis Bacon, ‘Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates’ and ‘Of Plantations’. In The Essays or Counsels, Civill and Morall, ed. M. Kiernan (Oxford, 2000), 89–99, 106–08.


Secondary reading:


Hörnqvist, Mikael, Machiavelli and Empire (Cambridge, 2004).


Appendix: Past Papers and Examiners’ Reports

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

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

2021-22

Examiner: Sylvana Tomaselli

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

What contributed to making these scripts outstanding is that their authors thought about the wording of the questions very carefully. They made most of the opportunity these terms opened up to display detailed knowledge and responsiveness to nuanced phrasing. Thus, they addressed what the people had been blamed for by the different critics of democracy in ancient Athens in answering question 9: ‘Did opposition to democracy amount to no more than blaming the people’. The less impressive scripts merely listed what was said by critics about the ignorance and self-interestedness of the people. Such answers did not tackle the question as it stood. Likewise, candidates who tackled the More question divided between those who reflected on what might (or might not) be deemed fairness and those who did not in answering: ‘Does the ‘fairness’ that is identified by Raphael Hythloday as a key quality of the Utopian commonwealth imply it should be regarded as a democracy’. The best essays reflected on the nature of fairness in Utopia, whether its governance could be deemed democratic, and whether a conception of fairness related to its governance. Amongst the very best answers were some on Aristotle and Roman political thought. There were 12 first-class marks, 5 lower seconds, and the rest obtained upper seconds. There 16 answers on Plato, 17 on Machiavelli, 11 on More, 7 on Locke, and 6 on Aristotle. All other authors were discussed by at least one candidate, with the question on Aquinas receiving 2 very strong answers. It may be that the question on Hobbes was deemed particularly challenging as it met with little response. Candidates who were not familiar with Machiavelli’s Discourses inevitably struggled with the question: ‘What is the significance of Machiavelli’s claim, in his Discourse on Livy, that the ancient Romans were more virtuous than they were fortunate?’. In such cases, they wrote of fortuna in The Prince, with no less inevitable consequences. For the Plato question, ‘Is Plato’s ideal city best seen as an attempt to satisfy the requirements of human nature?’, some reflected on the precise requirements of human nature according to Plato’s Republic, considered the city of pigs as well the ideal city in relation to meeting such requirements, and specified whose (if not all human beings) requirements might or might not be met in Kallipolis. In sum, whatever the topic candidates who read questions attentively, thought of the issues underpinning them, and demonstrated close attention to the detailed argumentation in the set texts wrote engaging scripts and were duly rewarded for doing so.
In Section B, there were some impressive answers amongst the 6 that tackled Greek critics of democracy as well as those which discussed ‘For early modern political theorists, how important was the question of origins in determining both the nature and the location of sovereign power?’. Weaker responses to the latter question tended to leave out or brush over one or more of the key terms ‘origins’, ‘nature’, or ‘location’. All Section B questions received at least one answer bar two, namely ‘To what extent did medieval thinkers recover the classical understanding of civic liberty?’ and ‘How important was justice in the resistance theories of the sixteenth century?’. The question on Roman political thought and early Christian thought each attracted 5 replies. The question of Renaissance humanist political thought (‘How important in Renaissance humanist political thought is the use of comparison?’) received most (8), some of which were very impressive in that they revealed extensive reading of the texts and the scholarly literature. They noted comparisons between individuals as well as regimes and specified the precise nature of their use by various Renaissance humanists.

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

2020-21

Examiner: Christopher Brooke

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

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

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

Turning now to those particular questions, some comments follow on those where we have five or more answers (so as to make generalisation possible). In Section A, stronger answers on Plato tended either to reflect on how the word ‘utopian’ can be taken in different ways or to discuss the way in which the analogy between the city and the soul complicates a straightforward answer to the question. The more successful
essays on Aristotle got stuck into particular parts of his discussions of particular issues rather than just offering an overview of the basic argument. The essays on Machiavelli were stronger to the extent that they identified points of disagreement between the arguments of the Prince and the Discourses and talked about those; weaker essays offered bland summary of some of the things that the two texts had in common, which wasn’t helpful in getting a grip on the central issue raised by the question. The essays on More were generally fairly good, though a surprising number ended up spending too long discussing topics that weren’t really relevant to the matter at hand. Essays on Hobbes often focused too narrowly on his argument about the covenant early on (sometimes also the state of nature and the laws of nature), bypassing his various practical discussions of how the Sovereign might prevent the commonwealth from falling apart through judicious management of religion, education, opinion, and so on. The weaker essays on Locke explained how he was disagreeing with Filmer; the stronger essays paid specific attention to the intriguing mention of ‘a Captain of a Galley’ in the title quotation.

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

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

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

2019-20

Examiner: Sylvana Tomaselli

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

A few points emerge that reiterate reports of previous years. The first is that while some candidates clearly mastered a wide array of subjects, some were more narrowly focused on the Ancients, and while these included excellent and clearly distinct answers, some came close to repeating the same material. The second is that some scripts seemed oblivious of the fact that they needed to be legible. The third is that, in some cases, there was a lack of critical engagement with the question and/or inattentiveness as to its precise nature. This was evident, for instance, in some of the answers to the question on More (‘To what extent
should we regard Thomas More’s *Utopia* as exposing the perils of hereditary monarchy?*) in which monarchy and aristocracy were amalgamated into one, their hereditary aspect left unexamined, every social ill deemed, by More, to be attributable to hereditary monarchy, and the government of Utopia itself left bereft of scrutiny.

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

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

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

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

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

2018-19

Examiner: Christopher Brooke

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

The more popular questions were on Plato (19 answers), Machiavelli (18), More (15), Aristotle (14—more popular than usual), Athenian democracy (10), *raison d’état* (9), and Renaissance humanism (7—less popular than usual). All questions attracted at least one answer—though Aquinas, the mediaeval reception of classical thought, and the English Civil War attracted only one answer. The mediaeval topics were not wholly
neglected: there were four answers on Augustine, four on the early Christians, three on papal power, and two on Roman law. We had fewer answers than we normally receive on Hobbes and Locke.

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

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

In Section B, answers to the question on Athenian democracy sometimes spent too long discussing rhetoric or knowledge when there was still quite a bit to say about equality. The stronger essays on Renaissance humanism saw that there were different conceptions of liberty in the various texts, and discussed what some of these were. Some answers on raison d’état were strong, with good knowledge especially of Botero on display, but they were strongest when they addressed the precise theme picked out by the question (the relationship between prudence and virtue), rather than just saying a few things about prudence, and a few things about virtue. Essays on international law often expressed criticism of early modern European imperialism, but were stronger to the extent that they were able to explore this theme through the theoretical texts under consideration.
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Forty-two candidates sat the paper, slightly up on last year’s thirty-eight. Six received an overall First-class mark, there were thirty-three Upper Seconds, and three Lower Seconds. The median mark was 65, and the mean 65.33.

The Plato question is perennially popular, attracting twenty answers this year, after which they lined up as follows: Machiavelli (14), Locke (12), Renaissance humanism (12), More (9), Hobbes (8), Aristotle (7), Athenian democracy (7), Augustine (6), sovereignty (6), mediaeval reception of classical thought (5), Romans (4), British revolutions (4), resistance theory (3), international law (3), toleration (3), early Christians (2),
Aquinas (1), and raison d’état (1), with two of the mediaeval questions, on spiritual and temporal power and on Roman law, attracting no candidates.

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

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