Introduction to the History of Political Thought Papers:

For several decades now, Cambridge has been the 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.
Introduction to the Period:

This paper spans the history of western political reflection from the city states of ancient Greece to seventeenth-century argument about natural freedom, international law, natural rights, and their implications for political existence. It offers the chance to investigate ancient conceptions of political organization, human nature, virtue, and slavery, 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-surfedaced and were put to work in the Latin West in medieval debates on the relationship between the Church and other powers, the constitutional structure of the Church, kingdoms and cities. It covers humanist responses to the classical past and to classical conceptions of virtue in the political thought of Machiavelli and others, the convergence during the Reformation of various traditions in the Calvinist case for armed resistance to an unjust ruler, and moves beyond Europe to examine the theological and legal analysis of the legitimacy of European conquests in the New World.

Like POL8, POL7 is divided into two parts. Section A is devoted to a close contextual reading of the most important texts by those thinkers universally acknowledged as indispensable for an understanding of western political thought: Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, More, Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke. Section B is organized around groups of texts which are historically or thematically linked. Some belong together because they were written as contributions to the same controversy, others were separated by several centuries but belong to the same tradition of commentary and reflection on ancient authorities. The paper has been organized to bring out not merely the contrasts but also the continuities and similarities between its component parts, in many of which the same conceptual languages, analytical tools and pivotal terms are at work. You are encouraged to cross the lines dividing these themes and so to appreciate the fascinating ways in which thinkers remained indebted to enduring yet fluid traditions of enquiry which they re-interpreted, subverted, and moulded into new forms under pressure of new problems.

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—but it is worth appreciating that the traditions of political thought covered in POL7 are both cumulative and interlinked, so, even if a lecture is not directly on a topic you are studying, that does not mean it will not help you to understand it. (Do bear in mind, too, that exam questions are proposed by the lecturers.) 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: As with other papers in Politics, 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-one named authors (section A) and historical topics (section B) that make up the syllabus, in 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. What you need to do, therefore, is to construct, in conjunction with your supervisor and your supervision partner, a suitable intellectual pathway through this paper. There is no single model of how to do this and different students will find different solutions. Before you start, you should make an initial choice of, say, authors and topics; these will preferably have thematic or historical connections between them. The following eight pathways through the paper offer suggestions—not more than that—as to how you might go about doing this.
### Ancient Political Thought
- A1. Plato
- A2. Aristotle
- B9. Greek democracy and its critics
- B10. Roman political thought
- A3. Augustine

And then either B13. The medieval reception of classical political thought, or A4. Aquinas, or A6. Machiavelli

### Early Modern Political Thought
- B17. Reason of state
- B18. Sovereignty
- B20. The British revolutions
- A8. Locke
- B21. Toleration in the later C17th

### Mediaeval Political Thought
- A2. Aristotle
- B11. Early Christian political thought
- A3. Augustine
- A4. Aquinas
- B12. Temporal and spiritual in medieval political thought
- B13. The medieval reception of classical political thought

### Religion and Politics
- B11. Early Christian political thought
- A3. Augustine
- A4. Aquinas
- B12. Temporal and spiritual in medieval political thought
- B16. Obedience and resistance in Reformation political thought
- B21. Toleration in the later C17th

### Foundations of Modern Political Thought
- A6. Machiavelli
- B16. Obedience and resistance in Reformation political thought
- B17. Reason of state
- B19. Origins of international law
- A8. Locke

### The Legacy of Rome
- B10. Roman political thought
- B11. Early Christian political thought
- A3. Augustine
- B14. Roman law, C12-16th
- B15. Renaissance humanism
- A6. Machiavelli

### Natural Politics / Natural Law
- A2. Aristotle
- A4. Aquinas
- B18. Sovereignty
- B19. Origins of international law
- A8. Locke

### ‘Great Books’
- A1. Plato
- A2. Aristotle
- B10. Roman political thought
- Either A5. More or A6. Machiavelli
- B17. Reason of state
The Examination: 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.

SECTION A
1. Plato
2. Aristotle
3. Augustine
4. Aquinas
5. More
6. Machiavelli
7. Hobbes
8. Locke

SECTION B
9. Greek democracy and its critics
10. Roman political thought from the republic to the principate
11. Early Christian political thought
12. Temporal and spiritual in medieval political thought
13. The medieval reception of classical political thought
14. Argument from Roman law in political thought, 12th -16th centuries
15. Renaissance humanist political thought
16. Obedience and resistance in Reformation political thought
17. Reason of state
18. Sovereignty
19. The origins of international law
20. The political and religious thought of the British revolutions
21. Toleration in the later 17th century
Lectures will take place in the History Faculty Building unless otherwise indicated

Michaelmas Term

DR M. J. RYAN AND DR A.S. BRETT
Plato and Aristotle. (Eight lectures) Tu. 11

DR M.J. BRETT
Romans and Christians. (Four lectures, weeks 1-4) W. 11

DR M. J. RYAN AND DR A.S. BRETT
Renaissance humanism, Machiavelli, and reason of state. (Four lectures, weeks 5-8) W. 11

DR A.S. BRETT
Hobbes. (Four lectures, weeks 1-4). M. 10

Lent Term

DR M.J. RYAN
Roman law and political thought. (Eight lectures) F. 10

DR M.J. RYAN
Temporal and spiritual in medieval political thought. (Four lectures, weeks 1-4) Tu. 9

DR M.J. RYAN
Calvinist political thought. (Four lectures, weeks 5-8) Tu. 9

Easter Term

PROF. M. GOLDIE
Sovereignty, revolution and toleration, 1570-1700. (Four lectures, weeks 1-4) Tu. 11
SAMPLE EXAMINATION PAPER

SECTION A

1. How successfully did Plato accommodate different conceptions of happiness in Republic?

2. Was Aristotle’s account of constitutions and constitutional change determined by his theory of justice?

3. What role did the concept of nature play in Augustine’s political thought?

4. ‘In the law of Christ, kings must be subject to priests’ [AQUINAS, De regimine principum, chapter III]. What implications does this have for Aquinas’ broader political theory?

5. Do you agree that it was More’s intention to portray the Utopians as living a perfectly virtuous and hence a truly Christian life?

6. Assess the role of the common good in Machiavelli’s political thought.

7. Does Hobbes suggest that there are limits to the duties which a subject may owe the sovereign?

8. ‘In his account of tyranny and its remedy, Locke regards the ruler and not the people as engaging in rebellion.’ Is this a fair view of Locke’s meaning?

SECTION B

9. What risks to the polis did Greek democracy represent in the eyes of its critics?

10. How did Roman thinkers react to the collapse of the republic?

11. On what grounds did different early Christian thinkers affirm and reject civic duty?

12. Why did it take opponents of papal power so long to formulate an articulate defence of their position?

13. What room did medieval authors leave for the classical citizen?

14. ‘Public law is that which relates to the general condition of the Roman Empire’ (Ulpian, Digest 1.1.1). Discuss.

15. Are the political differences between renaissance humanists reducible to advocacy of republican as opposed to advocacy of princely government?

16. What was the importance of natural law and natural reason in resistance theory towards the end of the sixteenth century?

17. What if anything distinguished reason of state from Machiavellianism?

18. What impact did individualism have on theories of sovereignty?

19. How respectful of the autonomy of states were early international law theorists?

20. How useful a category is ‘republicanism’ for understanding the political thought of the British Civil Wars?

21. Why were the leading advocates of toleration all Protestants?
Set text:


Secondary reading:

**Abbreviation:**


**Suggested secondary reading:**


*C. Farrar, *The Origins of Democratic Thinking* (1988), ch. 7*


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

______, *Greek and Roman Political Ideas* (Pelican 2014)*


*M. Schofield, ‘Approaching the *Republic*, in CHGRPT, ch. 10*


*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]*

**Further secondary reading:**


M. Lane, Plato’s Progeny: How Socrates and Plato Still Captivate the Modern Mind (2001)


A.W. Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth in Classical Greek Philosophy (2004), chs 3, 4


**Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):**


What importance does the common good have in the argument of Plato’s *Republic*? (2015)

What is the significance of the ‘city of pigs’ for the argument of Plato’s *Republic*? (2014)

A2 ARISTOTLE
Set texts:


Secondary reading:

Abbreviations:

Suggested secondary reading:
*J. Lear, Aristotle: The Desire to Understand (1988)
M.C. Nussbaum, ‘Shame, separateness, and political unity: Aristotle’s criticism of Plato’, in Rorty
*J. Ober, Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule (1998), chs 1, 6
*C. Rowe, ‘Aristotelian constitutions’, in CHGRPT, pp. 366-89
M. Schofield, ‘Equality and hierarchy in Aristotle’s thought’, in his Saving the City (1999), ch. 6

Further secondary reading:
M.F. Burnyeat, ‘Aristotle on learning to be good’, in Rorty, ch. 5
J. Frank, A democracy of distinction (Chicago 2005)
T.H. Irwin, ‘Moral science and political theory in Aristotle’, History of Political Thought, 6 (1985), 150-68
D. Keyt, ‘Three basic theorems in Aristotle’s Politics’, in Keyt & Miller
W. Kullmann, ‘Man as a political animal in Aristotle’, in Keyt & Miller
M. Lane, Greek and Roman Political Ideas (Pelican 2014)
W.R. Newell, ‘Superlative virtue: the problem of monarchy in Aristotle’s Politics’, in Lord & O’Connor
M.C. Nussbaum, The Fragility of Goodness (1986), chs 11-12

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

2 ‘A city [polis] is made up not only of a plurality, but also of men who are different in kind’ [ARISTOTLE, The Politics, Book II]. Comment. (2016)

Why, for Aristotle, was natural instinct insufficient to create successful political communities? (2015)
Was Aristotle justified in understanding monarchy as a constitution (politeia)? (2014)

A3 AUGUSTINE
Set text:


Secondary reading:

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

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

Further secondary reading:
P.D. Bathory, Political Theory as Public Confession: the Social and Political Thought of St Augustine of Hippo (1981)
H.N. Baynes, The Political Ideas of St Augustine’s ‘De Civitate Dei’ (1962)
———, Augustine of Hippo (1967)
H. Chadwick, The Early Church (1967), ch. 15
———, Augustine (1986)
D. Earl, The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome (1967), ch. 6
J.N. Figgis, The Political Aspects of St Augustine’s ‘City of God’ (1921)
P. Garnsey, Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine, chs 13-14
———, ‘The influence of Saint Augustine on early medieval political theory’, Augustinian Studies, 12 (1981), 1-10
P. Ramsey, ‘The just war according to St Augustine’ in J.B. Elshtain, ed., Just War Theory (1992)
J. Rist, Augustine (1994)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What are the implications for Augustine’s political theory of his conviction that ‘true justice is found only in that commonwealth whose founder and ruler is Christ’ [AUGUSTINE, The City of God, Book II]? (2016)

Could we call Augustine’s The City of God a manual of Christian citizenship? (2015)

‘Rome itself is like a second Babylon’ [AUGUSTINE, The City of God, Book XVIII]. Discuss. (2014)
AQUINAS

Set text:

Thomas Aquinas, Political Writings, trans. R. W. Dyson (Cambridge, 2002)

Secondary reading:

Abbreviation:

Suggested secondary reading:
J. Barnes, ‘The just war’, in CHLMP, ch. 41
*J.P. Canning, A History of Medieval Political Thought 300-1450 (1996), ch. 3
J. Coleman, A History of Political Thought: From the Middle Ages to the Renaissance (2000), ch. 2
J. Finnis, Aquinas: Moral, Political, and Legal Theory (Oxford, 1998), chs 7, 8
M. Keys, Aquinas, Aristotle and the promise of the common good (Cambridge 2008)
*D.E. Luscombe, ‘Natural morality and natural law’, in CHLMP, ch. 37
* ———, ‘The state of nature and the origin of the state’, in CHLMP, ch. 40
W. Ullmann, The medieval Papacy, St. Thomas and beyond, in Ullmann, Law and Tradition in the Middle Ages (1988)

Further secondary reading:
A. Black, Political Thought in Europe 1250-1450 (1992), ch. 1
B. Davies, The Thought of Thomas Aquinas (1992)
J. Dunbabin, ‘The reception and interpretation of Aristotle’s Politics’, in CHLMP, ch. 38
L.P. Fitzgerald, ‘St Thomas Aquinas and the two powers’, Angelicum, 56 (1979), 515-56
E. Gilson, The Christian Philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas (1957), pt III, chs 3-5
———, A History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages (1955)
A. Kenny, Aquinas (Oxford 1980)
A. de Libera, La philosophie médiévale (2nd edn, 1995), esp. pp. 355-418
F. van Steenberghen, Thomas Aquinas and Radical Aristotelianism (1980)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):
What was the role of nature in Thomas Aquinas’s political theory? (2016)
Was politics, for Aquinas, ultimately a matter of virtue rather than law? (2015)
What follows, for Aquinas, from the position that law is ‘a thing of reason’? (2014)
A5 MORE

Set text:


Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:

Further secondary reading:
J.C. Davis, Utopia and the Ideal Society: A study of English utopian writing, 1516-1700 (1981), ch. 2
A. Fox, Thomas More: History and Providence (1982), ch. 2
A. Fox and J. Guy, eds, Reassessing the Henrician Age (1986), pt I
J. Guy, Thomas More (2000)
G.B. Wegemer, Young Thomas More and the Arts of Liberty (Cambridge 2011)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

To what extent should we regard Thomas More’s Utopia as exposing the perils of hereditary monarchy? (2016)

Is it plausible to regard More’s Utopia as constituting an Italianate answer to the politics of northern Europe? (2015)

Does More’s Utopia resolve the dilemma of counsel raised in Book I of that work? (2014)
A6 MACHIAVELLI

Set texts:


Secondary reading:


Suggested secondary reading:

H. Baron, ‘Machiavelli the republican citizen and author of The Prince’, in Baron, In Search of Florentine Humanism (2 vols; 1988), vol. II
*F. Gilbert, Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Italy (1984 edn)
———, ‘The theme of gloria in Machiavelli’, Renaissance Quarterly, 30 (1977), 588-631
* ———, ‘Machiavelli’s Discorsi and the pre-humanist origin of republican ideas’, in Bock, ch. 6
*P. Stacey, Roman monarchy and the renaissance prince (Cambridge 2007)
*M. Viroli, ‘Machiavelli and the republican idea of politics’, in Bock, ch. 7
———, Machiavelli (1998)

Further secondary reading:

M. Hörnqvist, Machiavelli and Empire (2005), chs 2-4
H. Pitkin, Fortune is a Woman: Gender and Politics in the Thought of Niccolò Machiavelli (1984)
N. Rubinstein, ‘Machiavelli and Florentine republican experience’, in Bock, ch. 1
D.J. Wilcox, The Development of Florentine Humanist Historiography in the 15th Century (1969)
M. Viroli, From Politics to Reason of State (1992)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How should we explain Machiavelli’s conviction that ‘government by the populace is better than government by princes’ [MACHIAVELLI, Discourses on Livy, Book I]? (2016)

‘All the states, all the dominions that have held sway over men, have been either republics or principalities’ [, The Prince, Ch. 1]. Does this dichotomy determine how Machiavelli thought about politics? (2015)

Why was war so central to Machiavelli’s political thought? (2014)
A7 HOBBES


Secondary reading:


Suggested secondary reading:
N. Malcolm, Aspects of Hobbes (Oxford 2002), esp. chs 1, 2, 5, and 13  
* D. Runciman, Pluralism and the Personality of the State (Cambridge 1997), ch. 2  
* ____, Hobbes and republican liberty (Cambridge 2008)  

Further secondary reading:
C. Condren, Thomas Hobbes (Twayne 2000)  
S. Lloyd, Ideals as interests in Hobbes’s ‘Leviathan’ (Cambridge 1992)  
M. Oakeshott, ‘Introduction to Leviathan’ [1946], in Hobbes on Civil Association (1975), ch. 1  
T. Sorell, Hobbes (1986), esp. chs 1-2, 8-10  

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

‘This is more than Consent, or Concord; it is a reall Unitie of them all, in one and the same Person’ [HOBBES, Leviathan, Ch. 17]. Why was Hobbes so insistent on this point? (2016)


What relationship did Hobbes see between self-preservation and sociability? (2014)
A8 LOCKE

Set texts:

or in Locke, Second Treatise of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration,
ed. Mark Goldie (Oxford World's Classics, 2016)

Suggested additional primary reading:

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
D. Armitage, ‘John Locke, Carolina and the Two treatises of government’,
Political Theory 32 (2004), 602-27
R. Ashcraft, ‘Revolutionary politics and Locke’s Two Treatises’, Political Theory, 8 (1980), 429-86
J. Dunn, The Political Thought of John Locke (1969)
———, ‘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)
J. Scott, England’s Troubles (2000), ch. 16
J. Scott, ‘The law of war: Grotius, Sidney, Locke and the political theory of rebellion’,
History of Political Thought, 13 (1992), 565-85
J. Tully, A Discourse on Property (1980)
*———, An Approach to Political Theory: Locke in Contexts (1993), esp. ch. 1
J. Waldron, God, Locke, and Equality (2002)

Further secondary reading:
R. Ashcraft, John Locke’s Two Treatises of Government (1987)
J. Dunn, ‘What is living and what is dead in the political theory of John Locke?’, in Dunn,
Interpreting Political Responsibility (1990)
R. Grant, John Locke’s Liberalism (1987)
I. Harris, The Mind of John Locke (1994)
D.A. Lloyd Thomas, Locke on Government (1995)
K. Olivekrona, ‘Appropriation in the state of nature’, in J. Lively and A. Reeve, eds,

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

‘The community may make compounded and mixed forms of government, as they think good’ [LOCKE,
Second Treatise, § 132]. Do Locke’s foundational political principles tend toward any particular form of
government? (2016)

Was Locke’s Second Treatise of Government more a defence of property than of liberty? (2015)

In the Second Treatise, what power does Locke give the legislative, and why? (2014)
B9. GREEK DEMOCRACY AND ITS CRITICS

Primary reading:

Abbreviation: EGPT = M. Gagarin and P. Woodruff (eds), Early Greek Political Thought from Homer to the Sophists (Cambridge, 1995)

Suggested primary reading:
Herodotus, Histories, bk III. 80-3 [in EGPT]
Ps-Xenophon (the Old Oligarch), ‘Constitution of Athens’ [in EGPT]
Aristophanes, The Knights
Isocrates, ‘Panegyricus’ (vol. I); ‘Areopagiticus’, ‘Antidosis’ (vol. II); ‘Against Callimachus’ (vol. III), all in Isocrates, Loeb Classical Library (3 vols; 1961-1968)
Thucydides, History, bk II. 35-46, 60-64, bk III. 37-48 [in EGPT]
Euripides, Suppliant Maidens, ll. 399-456 [in EGPT]
Plato, Protagoras, 320-8; Gorgias: Republic, bks VI, VIII
Aristotle, Politics, bks III-VI

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
J. Dunn, Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future (2nd edn, 1993), ch. 1
M.H. Hansen, Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes (1991, 1999), esp. chs 1, 13
M. Lane, Greek and Roman Political Ideas (Pelican 2014)
C. Meier, The Greek Discovery of Politics (1990)
J. Miller, ‘Warning the Demos: Political Communication with a Democratic Audience in Demosthenes’, History of Political Thought, 23 (2002), 401-17
R. Osborne, Athens and Athenian Democracy (2010)
A. Saxonhouse, Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens (2008)
G. de Ste Croix, The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World (1981; rev. 1983), ch. 7 & appdx IV

Further secondary reading:
M.I. Finley, Democracy Ancient and Modern (2nd edn, 1985)
M.H. Hansen, Was Athens a Democracy? (1989)
J.T. Roberts, Athens on Trial: The Antidemocratic Tradition in Western Thought (1994)
P. Vidal-Naquet, Democracy Ancient and Modern (1995), esp. pp. 82-140
B. Williams, Shame and Necessity (1988)
H. Yunis, Taming Democracy (1996)
Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

To what extent did the differences between democrats and anti-democrats in ancient Athens turn on differing conceptions of political knowledge? (2016)

Did proponents and critics of democracy in ancient Athens agree on the end but disagree on the means of politics? (2015)

How far was the nature and control of public speech the central issue for both democrats and anti-democrats in ancient Athens? (2014)

B10. ROMAN POLITICAL THOUGHT FROM THE REPUBLIC TO THE PRINCIPATE

Suggested primary reading

Sallust, The war with Catiline and The war with Jugurtha, Loeb Classical Library (1921)

Secondary reading

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

Suggested secondary reading:
J. Connolly, The life of Roman republicanism (Princeton 2014)

Further secondary reading:
———, ‘Cicero’, in CHGRPT, pp. 477-516
D. Hoyos ed., A companion to Roman imperialism (Brill 2013), chh. by Stevenson and Adler
———, Saving the City: Philosopher-Kings and Other Classical Paradigms (London, 1999), ch. 10.
Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Was Roman political thought intrinsically imperialist? (2016)

How did Roman political thinkers understand and solve the problem of social division? (2015)

In what ways was Roman political thought ‘Roman’? (2014)

B11. EARLY CHRISTIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Suggested primary reading:

The Epistle of St Paul to the Romans, ch. 13, New Testament

Tertullian, Apology (Loeb, 1984)

Lactantius, Divine Institutes, trans. A. Bowen and P. Garnsey (Liverpool, 2003), bks 3-5.

Ambrose, De officiis, ed. and trans. I.J. Davidson, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 2001),


Secondary reading

Abbreviation:

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

Suggested secondary reading:


Further secondary reading:


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


M. Colish, The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages, 2 vols (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 34-5, 1985)


And see above, A3, under Augustine.

*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

Were the political theories of early Christian thinkers defined by their differing visions of the Church? (2016)

‘Not so much a wholesale rejection as a re-writing of classical political theory.’ Do you agree with this evaluation of early Christian political thought? (2015)

What became of the notion of commonwealth (*res publica*) in early Christian thought? (2014)

**B12. TEMPORAL AND SPIRITUAL IN MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THOUGHT**

**Suggested primary reading**

- 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.

**Secondary reading**

*Abbreviation:*


*Suggested secondary reading:*

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

*Further secondary reading:*


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

‘The disagreements over papal and secular power in the decades around 1300 were essentially disagreements about the consequences of the Fall.’ Do you agree? (2016)

How important were medieval arguments concerning government within the church to conceptualising the relationship between temporal and spiritual government? (2015)

What was the importance of historical argument in medieval controversies over the relationship between spiritual and temporal powers? (2014)

**B13. MEDIEVAL RECEPTION OF CLASSICAL POLITICAL THOUGHT IN THE LATIN WEST**

Suggested primary reading


Peter of Auvergne, ‘Commentary and Questions on Book III of Aristotle’s Politics (selections)’, in *Cambridge Translations*, as above


Secondary reading

Abbreviations:


Suggested secondary reading:


J. Dunbabin, ‘The reception and interpretation of Aristotle’s Politics’, in CHLMP, ch. 38

L. Peterman, ‘Dante’s Monarchy and Aristotle’s political thought’, Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History 10 (1973), 1-40
V. Syros, ‘The sovereignty of the multitude in the works of Marsilius of Padua, Peter of Auvergne and some other Aristotelian commentators’, in The world of Marsilius of Padua, as above

Further secondary reading:
J. Aertsen and A. Speer eds., Was ist Philosophie im Mittalter? / What is Philosophy in the Middle Ages? (Berlin 1998 = Miscellanea Mediaevalia 26)
C. Flüeler, L. Lanza and M. Toste eds., Peter of Auvergne: University master of the 13th century (Berlin 2015)
D. Luscombe, ‘Commentaries on the Politics’, in Weijers and Holt

See also the extensive bibliography online at http://www.paleography.unifr.ch/petrus_de_alvernia/ (click on Bibliographia)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How did medieval political thinkers respond to ancient concepts of citizenship and citizen rule? (2016)

How did the encounter with classical political thought impact upon the way medieval authors thought about the government of princes? (2015)

In what ways and to what effect did medieval authors appeal to the concept of nature in their political philosophy? (2014)

B14. ARGUMENT FROM ROMAN LAW IN POLITICAL THOUGHT, 12TH-16TH CENTURIES

Primary reading

Suggested primary reading (not on Camtools):
Justinian’s Institutes, trans. P. Birks and G. McLeod (London, 1987), 1.1, 1.2
Available online at http://www.constitution.org/sps.html

Suggested primary reading (on Camtools):
Azo: Selections from Summa codicis and Lectura codicis, on Code 3.13 and 8.52.2 respectively.
Azo: Glosses to Digest, 1.1.5; 1.1.9; 1.3.31-32; 1.4.1; 3.4.
Accursius: Standard Gloss to Code 3.13 and 8.52(53) 2; Digest 1.1.5; 1.1.9; 1.3.31; 1.3.32; 1.4.1; 3.4.
Marinus de Caramanico: Select passages from the Proemium to his commentary on the Constitutions of the Kingdom of Sicily.
Cinus of Pistoia: Introduction to a legal opinion on the laws of Florence.
Johannes Faber: Select passages from commentary to C. 1.1.1.
Bartolus of Sassoferrato: Selections from commentary on D. 1.1.9.
Oldradus de Ponte: Select passages from Consilium 69 and 83.
Baldus de Ubaldis: Select passages from his legal opinion Rex Romanorum and his commentary on D. 1.1.9.
Petrus Helyas: Select passages from his legal opinion on the war between France and England.
Jean de Terre Vermeille (Jean de Terre Rouge): Select passages from his treatise *On those who rebel against their kings*.
Jacques Cujas: Selections from his *Observationes* on C. 6.23.3 and 6.32.3.

Secondary reading

**Abbreviations:**

TRHS: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

**Suggested secondary reading:**

* ———, *Ideas of power in the late middle ages 1296-1417* (Cambridge 2011), Ch. 5.
* C. Woolf, *Bartolus of Sassoferrato: His Position in the History of Medieval Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1913)

**Further secondary reading:**

———, *The Political Thought of Baldus de Ubaldis* (Cambridge, 1987; reissued 2002)


**Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):**

To whom did medieval experts in Roman law accord the power to legislate and why? (2016)
Was private law more important than public law in the political thought of the Roman lawyers? (2015)
What did medieval lawyers understand by the term ‘people’ (*populus*)? (2014)
Abbreviations:

Kraye: J. Kraye, ed. Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts
(2 vols; 1997), vol. II: Political Philosophy

Suggested primary reading:

Bartolomeo Sacchi (Il Platina), ‘On the Prince’ [1471], in Kraye, ch. 6
Bartolomeo Scala, ‘Dialogue on Laws and Legal Judgements’ [1483], in Kraye, ch. 12
Giovanni Pontano, ‘On the Prince’, in Kraye, ch. 5
Aurelio Lippo Brandolini, ‘Republics and Kingdoms Compared’ [*c*. 1491], ed. and tr. J. Hankins
(I Tatti Renaissance Library, Harvard 2009)
Francesco Guicciardini, ‘How the Popular Government Should be Reformed’ [1512], in Kraye, ch. 13
or ed. B. Crick (Penguin, 1970)

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:

J.M. Blythe, “Civic humanism” and medieval political thought’, in Renaissance Civic Humanism:
Reappraisals and reflections (2000), pp. 30-74
*J. Hankins, ‘Rhetoric, history and ideology: the civic panegyrics of Leonardo Bruni’, in Renaissance Civic
Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections (2000), pp. 143-78
*P. Kristeller, ‘Humanism’, in CHRP, ch. 5
Interpretation (1982), pp. 153-200
on Western Europe (1990), pp. 43-65
M. Viroli, From Politics to Reason of State (1992)

Further secondary reading:

H. Baron, The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance (2nd edn, 1966), esp. the ‘Epilogue’
J. Hankins, The “Baron thesis” after forty years and some recent studies of Leonardo Bruni’,
J. Kraye, ‘Moral Philosophy’, in CHRP, ch. 11
J. McConica, Erasmus (1991)
J.G.A. Pocock, The Machiavellian Moment (1975; reissue with new postscript 2003), pt II
J.E. Seigel, Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism (1968)
Q. Skinner, ‘Political philosophy’, in CHRP, ch. 12, rev. as ‘Republican virtues in an age of princes’
______, Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes (1996), ch. 2
R.G. Witt, ‘In the Footsteps of the Ancients’: The origins of humanism from Lovato to Bruni (2000),
esp. ch. 11
Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Why did Renaissance humanist writers on politics think that virtue was so important, and how did they think it could be attained? (2016)

How distinctive was the contribution that Renaissance humanists made to the political theory of the fifteenth and earlier sixteenth centuries? (2015)

How did the style of Renaissance political thought affect its substance? (2014)

B16 OBEDIENCE AND RESISTANCE IN REFORMATION POLITICAL THOUGHT

Suggested primary reading:

Luther and Calvin, On Secular Authority, ed. H. Höpfl (Cambridge, 1991)
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)
François Hotman, Francogallia [1573], trans. R.E. Giesey and J.H.M. Salmon (Cambridge, 1972)

Secondary reading:

Abbreviation:

Suggested secondary reading:
H. Höpfl, The Christian Polity of John Calvin (1982), chs 7, 8
*R.M. Kingdon, ‘Calvinism and resistance theory’, in Burns and Goldie, ch. 7
A.E. McGrath, Reformation Thought: An Introduction (1988), chs 5, 8
F. Oakley, ‘Christian obedience and authority’, in Burns and Goldie, ch. 6
*Q. Skinner, Foundations of Modern Political Thought (2 vols; 1978), vol II: The Age of Reformation

Further secondary reading:
W. Balke, Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals (1981), chs 2, 10
J. H. Burns, ‘The political thought of George Buchanan’, Scottish Historical Review, 30 (1951), 60-8
W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, The Political Thought of Martin Luther (1984)
F.E. Cранz, An Essay on the Development of Luther’s Thought (1959)
D.R. Kelley, Francois Hotman: A Revolutionary’s Ordeal (1973)
S. Kusukawa, The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melanchthon (1995), ch. 5
I.D. McFarlane, Buchanan (1981), ch. 11, pt 2
J. Witte, Law and Protestantism: The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation (2002), ch. 4
———, The Reformation of Rights (2007)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Assess the importance and effectiveness of historical argument in Calvinist resistance tracts. (2016)
What was the role of law in sixteenth-century Protestant thinking on obedience and resistance? (2015)
To what extent did theological arguments shape Lutheran and Calvinist theories of resistance? (2014)

**B17 REASON OF STATE**

**Suggested primary reading:**

Justus Lipsius, Politica [1589], trans. J. Waszink (Amsterdam, 2004) or as Sixe Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine, trans. W. Jones [1594; on EEBO] (facs. repr. 1970)
Francis Bacon, ‘Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates’, ‘Of Empire’, ‘Of Simulation and Dissimulation’, in Essays (numerous editions)
Henri, duc de Rohan, Treatise of the Interests of the Princes and States of Christendom, trans. H. Hunt (1640) [on EEBO]

**Secondary reading:**

Suggested secondary reading:

*N. Keohane, Philosophy and the State in France: Renaissance to Enlightenment (1980), chs 4-5
*N. Malcolm, Hobbes and reason of state (Oxford
M. Peltonen, Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640 (1995), chs 3-4
R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1993), chs 2-4
*M. Viroli, From Politics to Reason of State (1992), chs 4-6

Further secondary reading:

W.F. Church, Richelieu and Reason of State (1973)
P.S. Donaldson, Machiavelli and Mystery of State (1988), chs 4-5
H. Höpfl, Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c.1540-1630 (2004), chs 5-8
F. Meinecke, The Doctrine of Raison d’État and its Place in Modern History (1957), chs 2-7
G. Oestreich, Neostoicism and the Early Modern State (1982), pt I
K.C. Schellhase, Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought (1976), chs 5-7

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

‘The achievement of reason of state was to isolate power as a distinctive component of political success.’ Do you agree? (2016)

Did the notion of ‘reason of state’ transform prior understandings of political community? (2015)

Was reason of state more a new understanding of the object of government than of government itself? (2014)

B18 SOVEREIGNTY

Suggested primary reading

John Cowell, The Interpreter (London, 1610), s.v. ‘King (Rex)’ [on EEBO]
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)
Hugo Grotius, The rights of war and peace, trans. F.W. Kelsey (3 vols; Oxford, 1913) or ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis 2005), Bk I chh. 3-4

Secondary reading:

Abbreviation:

Suggested secondary reading:
D. Baumgold, Contract theory in historical context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke (2010), chh. 2 and 4
A.S. Brett, Changes of state (2011), Ch. 5
J.H. Franklin, ‘Sovereignty and the mixed constitution: Bodin and his critics’, in CHPT, ch. 10

25
______, Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context (1992), Chh. 4-5
R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1992), Ch. 5
______, The sleeping sovereign (Cambridge 2016)

Further secondary reading:
G. Burgess, Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution (1996), Part I
H. Höpfl, Jesuit political thought (2004), chh. 9, 10, 13, 14
______, ‘The legacy of Jean Bodin: absolutism, populism or constitutionalism?’
______, ‘Absolutism and royalism’, in CHPT

For further reading on Hobbes see under A7

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Did theorists of sovereignty sacrifice all forms of political deliberation to the imperative of a ruling will? (2016)

What were early modern theories of sovereignty designed to refute? (2015)

Did early modern authors agree on the nature of sovereign power even while they disagreed on its origin and location? (2014)

**B19 ORIGINS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW**

**Suggested primary reading**

Francisco Suárez, On Laws and God the Law-giver, Bk II chh. 17-20; Bk III ch. 2; De Charitate Disputation XIII, ‘On war’, sections 1, 2, 4 and 5, in Francisco Suárez. Selections from Three Works (Oxford 1944) , vol. II (translation)
Alberico Gentili, De iure belli libri tres (Oxford: Clarendon 1933), vol. II (translation), Bk I chh. 1-6, 12-16

**Secondary reading**

Suggested secondary reading:
A. S. Brett, Changes of state, Nature and the limits of the city in early modern natural law (2011), chh. 1, 3, 8
G. Cavallar, The rights of strangers. Theories of international hospitality, the global community and political justice since Vitoria (2002), chh. 2 and 3

*B. Kingsbury and B. Straumann eds., The Roman foundations of the law of nations (2010), esp. chh. 7, 9, 15, 16


B. Tierney, The idea of natural rights (1997), Chh. 11-13


* R. Tuck, The rights of war and peace (1999), Introduction and chh. 1-3

Further secondary reading:

A. Anghie, Imperialism, sovereignty and the making of international law (2005), ch. 1

O. Asbach and P. Schröder eds., War, the state and international law in the seventeenth century (2010), esp. chh. 5 and 9

William Bain ed., Medieval Foundations of International Relations (Routledge, 2016)

L. Benton, A search for sovereignty. Law and geography in European Empires 1400-1900 (2010), esp. chh. 1, 3, 6


E. Keene, Beyond the anarchical society. Grotius, colonialism and order in world politics (2002)

M. Koskenniemi, ‘Empire and international law: The real Spanish contribution’, University of Toronto Law Journal 61 (2011)


______. Lords of all the world (1995), ch. 2


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

‘The early modern law of nations was effectively the law of war.’ Do you agree? (2016)

What was at stake in the early modern debate over whether the law of nations (ius gentium) was positive or natural law? (2015)

‘The legal face of empire.’ Is this a fair characterisation of early modern thought on law between nations? (2014)

B20. POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE BRITISH REVOLUTIONS

Suggested primary reading:

The civil war (all sources on eebo: no modern edition)

Henry Parker, Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses (1642)

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

The Commonwealth

John Milton, Political Writings, ed. M. Dzelzainis (Cambridge, 1991), esp. ‘The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates’ [1649] (pp. 3-48)


Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
* John Coffey, Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The mind of Samuel Rutherford (1997), ch. 6

* R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1993), ch. 6

Further secondary reading:


M. Dzelzainis, ‘Milton’s classical republicanism, in Armitage, Himy and Skinner eds., as above


* Michael Mendle, Henry Parker and the English Civil War (1995)

Michael Mendle, ed., The Putney Debates of 1647 (2001), esp. chs. by Mendle and Crawford


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

‘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 Parliamentarian cause face up to the implications of this claim? (2016)

Examine the role of the concept of ‘mixed polity’ in the political thought of the British Revolutions. (2015)

How central a value was liberty in the political thought of the British Revolutions? (2014)
B21 TOLERATION IN THE LATER SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Suggested Primary Reading:

Benedict de Spinoza, Theological-Political Treatise [1670], trans. R.H.M. Elwes (Dover, 1951), esp. ch. XIX
Samuel Parker, A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie, 3rd edn (London, 1671), esp. chs. 1, 3, 6.
Full text on EEBO via http://tinyurl.co.uk/2g9b

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:

Further secondary reading:
J. Israel, 'The intellectual debate about toleration in the Dutch Republic', in The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch republic, ed. J.I. Israel et al. (Leiden, 1997), pp. 3–36
J. Marshall, John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture (Cambridge, 2006)
R. Vernon, The Career of Toleration: John Locke, Jonas Proast, and After (Montreal, 1997)
Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How did late seventeenth-century theorists of toleration analyse the power of clergies? (2016)

Whom did the later seventeenth-century tolerationists not tolerate, and why? (2015)

Was toleration, in the hands of its early modern exponents, a form of individualism? (2014)