HUMAN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES TRIPOS
PART IIA

POL 7

HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT
TO c. 1700

COURSE GUIDE

2020 - 2021

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

1. Introduction to the History of Political Thought Papers:

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

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

2. Introduction to the Period:

This paper spans the history of 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-surfaced 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.

3. How to study for this paper

Lectures: Because the material to be covered spans a wide chronological and thematic range, and also because many students will not have studied the history of political thought before, a comprehensive array of lectures is offered. This need not cause you alarm since you are not required or expected to listen to them all (bearing in mind that all lectures in 2020-21 will be online)—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: For this paper, the norm is to have six paired supervisions for the paper spread over the Michaelmas and Lent terms. In these supervisions, you should cover six of the twenty-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 <u>four</u> authors and <u>two</u> 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, <u>in conjunction with your supervisor and your supervision partner</u>, 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.

4. Structure of the Paper

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A focuses on some of the most prominent political thinkers of the period, and you will study their major texts in depth. Section B offers a range of more thematic or historical topics, for which you will be expected to read across a range of primary texts, and reflect on the broader problems of historical and philosophical interpretation that confront historians of political thought and political theorists in studying this period. You will need to cover at least one topic from each section in the exam, but the precise balance you strike between the two sections is a matter for you to decide with your supervisor and supervision partner, although most students prefer to take a majority of their topics from Section A.

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

5. Some possible pathways through this paper (indicative/ illustrative only)

The following page indicates some possible pathways through the paper. It is in no sense meant to be directive, simply illustrative. Many other combinations are possible, and you should discuss your options with your supervisor and supervision partner.

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 A7. Hobbes 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 A7. Hobbes 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 A7. Hobbes A8. Locke	**'Great Books'** A1. Plato A2. Aristotle B10. Roman political thought *Either* A5. More *or* A6. Machiavelli B17. Reason of state *Either* A7. Hobbes *or* A8. Locke

6. Lectures

For guidance as to which lectures will be most relevant to your course of studies, you are advised to get in touch with your supervisor as early as possible in Michaelmas term.

All lectures will be online. Please consult online lecture lists for the most up-to-date information.

Introductory Session: An introductory session for HSPS students taking POL7 and POL8 will be held at noon on Thursday 8 October over Zoom:
https://zoom.us/j/93175761635?pwd=NWM1ZG4xY1h6Yk9JYXNuMy8xeXhLQT09

Michaelmas Term

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

DR M. RYAN
Spiritual and temporal powers in medieval political thought. (Four lectures, weeks 5-8) M. 11

DR M. RYAN
Plato's *Republic*.
(Four lectures, weeks 1-4) W. 9

PROF. A. BRETT
Hobbes and early seventeenth century political thought. (Four lectures, weeks 5-8) W. 9

PROF. A. BRETT
Aristotle, Rome and the medieval reception of classical thought. (Six lectures, weeks 1-6)
Th. 11

Lent Term

DR R. SERJEANTSON
Machiavelli, More and Renaissance Humanism. (Four lectures, weeks 1-4) Tu. 9

DR R. SERJEANTSON
Religion and revolution from the Civil Wars to Locke. (Four lectures, weeks 5-8) Tu. 9

PROF. A. BRETT
Sovereignty, reason of state and the origins of international law. (Six lectures, weeks 1-6) W. 9

Easter Term

DR M. RYAN
Roman law in medieval and Renaissance political thought.
(Four lectures, weeks 1-4) W. 9

DR M. RYAN
Calvinist resistance theory. (Four lectures, weeks 1-4) M. 11

7. The Examination

POL7 is marked by examiners appointed by POLIS; students taking the History versions of the paper will sit the same exams, 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 (from page 52), 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.)

SAMPLE EXAMINATION PAPER

Answer **three** questions, at least **one** from each section.

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?

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?

8. Reading Lists

A1 PLATO

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Set text:

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

The translations listed above are not available in digital editions through the UL. The library has available the two-volume Loeb edition, ed. by C. Emlyn-Jones and W. Preddy, (2013) (E); or the nineteenth-century translation by B. Jowett, (3rd. ed., 1888) (E)

Secondary reading:

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

Suggested secondary reading:
*J.M. Cooper, 'The psychology of justice in Plato', American Philosophical Quarterly, 14 (1977), 151-57, (E); repr. in Cooper, Reason and Emotion (1999)
C. Farrar, The Origins of Democratic Thinking (1988), ch. 7 (E)
*A. Laks, 'Legislation and demiurgy: on the relation between Plato's Republic and Laws', Classical Antiquity, 9 (1990), pp. 209-29 (E)
*M. Lane, 'Socrates and Plato: an introduction', in CHGRPT, ch. 8 (E)
_____, Greek and Roman Political Ideas (Pelican 2014); available online in its American edition under the title, The Birth of Politics: Eight Greek and Roman political ideas and why they matter, (2015) (E)
*A. Nehamas, 'The Republic', in Virtues of Authenticity: Essays on Plato and Socrates (1999) (M)
*J. Ober, Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule (1998), chs 1, 4 (E)
C.J Rowe, Plato (1984)
*M. Schofield, 'Approaching the Republic', in CHGRPT, ch. 10 (E)
G. Vlastos, 'Justice and happiness in Plato's Republic', in Vlastos, Platonic Studies (1973)
J. Waldron, 'What Plato would allow', in I. Shapiro & J. W. DeCew eds., Theory and Practice (1995) (M)
*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:
R. Bambrough, 'Plato's political analogies', in G. Vlastos, ed., Plato: A Collection of Critical Essays (1971), vol. II

M.F. Burnyeat, 'Utopia and fantasy: the practicability of Plato's ideally just city', in Psychoanalysis, Mind and Art, ed. J. Hopkins and A. Savile (1992); article reprinted in G. Fine, ed., Plato (1999), vol. II (M)

G.R.F. Ferrari ed., Plato's *Republic* (Cambridge 2007)

A, Laks, 'The Laws' in CHGRPT, ch. 12

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

J. Lear, 'Inside and outside the Republic', Phronesis, 37 (1992), 184-215 (E)

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

M.C. Nussbaum, The Fragility of Goodness (1986), ch. 5

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

M. Schofield, Plato (Oxford 2006)

J. Sikkenga, 'Plato's Examination of the Oligarchic Soul in Book VIII of the Republic', History of Political Thought, 23 (2002), 377-400 (E)

G. Vlastos, 'The theory of social justice in the polis in Plato's Republic', in H.F. North, ed., Interpretations of Plato (1977)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Do Plato's political recommendations satisfy the requirements of human psychology as identified in *Republic*? (2020)

How important is the city in Plato's attempt to demonstrate that the lives of the just are happier than the lives of the unjust? (2019)

'Isn't it appropriate for the rational element to rule, because it is wise and takes thought for the entire soul…?' [PLATO, Republic, Book IV]. Discuss. (2018)

'Plato's Republic is centrally about the construction of philosophy, rather than the construction of the city or the soul.' Discuss. (2017)

'There are three primary types of people: philosophic, victory-loving, and money-loving' [PLATO, *Republic*, Book IX]. Can Plato's ideal city satisfy everyone? (2016)

A2 ARISTOTLE

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Set texts:

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

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

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

These editions are not available from the UL, but see *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. by H. Rackham, rev. ed, (2014) (E). Book 1 of Crisp's 2000 edition is available on Moodle (M).

Secondary reading:

Abbreviations:
CHGRPT: C. Rowe and M. Schofield, eds, The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman
        Political Thought (2000) (E)
Keyt & Miller: D. Keyt and F.D. Miller, eds, A Companion to Aristotle's 'Politics' (1991)
Lord & O'Connor: C. Lord and D.K. O'Connor, eds, Essays on the Foundations of Aristotelian
        Political Science (1991)
Rorty: A.O. Rorty, ed., Essays on Aristotle's 'Ethics' (1980)

Suggested secondary reading:
A.W.H. Adkins, 'The connection between Aristotle's Ethics and Politics', in Keyt & Miller
J. Annas, The Morality of Happiness (1993), sections on Aristotle (E)
*J. Lear, Aristotle: The Desire to Understand (1988) (E)
R.G. Mulgan, 'Aristotle and the value of political participation', Political Theory, 18 (1990), 195-
        215 (E)
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 (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
* ———, 'Aristotle: an introduction', in CHGRPT, pp. 310-20 (E)
*B. Yack, The Problems of a Political Animal: Community, Justice and Conflict in Aristotelian
    Political Thought (1993)

Further secondary reading:
J. Barnes, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle (1995) (E)
M.F. Burnyeat, 'Aristotle on learning to be good', in Rorty, ch. 5
J. Frank, A democracy of distinction (Chicago 2005)

T.H. Irwin, 'Moral science and political theory in Aristotle', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 6 (1985), 150-68 (E)

D. Keyt, 'Three basic theorems in Aristotle's <u>Politics</u>', in Keyt & Miller

W. Kullmann, 'Man as a political animal in Aristotle', in Keyt & Miller

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

F.D. Miller, Jr, 'Naturalism', in CHGRPT, pp. 321-42 (E)

R.G. Mulgan, 'Aristotle's analysis of oligarchy and democracy', in Keyt & Miller

W.R. Newell, 'Superlative virtue: the problem of monarchy in Aristotle's <u>Politics</u>', in Lord & O'Connor

M.C. Nussbaum, <u>The Fragility of Goodness</u> (1986), chs 11-12

J. Ober, 'Aristotle's politics and society: class, status, and order in the <u>Politics</u>', in Lord & O'Connor

R.F. Stalley, 'Aristotle's criticism of Plato's <u>Republic</u>', in Keyt & Miller

B.S. Strauss, 'On Aristotle's critique of Athenian democracy', in Lord & O'Connor

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

'We should consider not only what form of government is best, but also what is possible and what is easily attainable by all' [ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, Book IV]. What impact did this insight have on the rest of Aristotle's political thought? (2020)

What was Aristotle's concept of a constitution (*politeia*), and what role did it play in his political thought? (2019)

What importance does Aristotle attach to equality? (2018)

How did Aristotle analyse and solve the problem of political division? (2017)

'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)

A3 AUGUSTINE

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Set text:

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

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

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
J. Herrin, The Formation of Christendom (1987), chs 2-3
R.L. Holmes, 'St. Augustine and the justification of war', in Holmes, On War and Morality (1989)
        (E)
E.J. Hundert, 'Augustine and the sources of the divided self', Political Theory, 20 (1992), 86-104
        (E)
*R.A. Markus, Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine (1970) (E)
* ———, 'The Latin Fathers', in J.H. Burns, ed., The Cambridge History of Medieval Political
        Thought, c.350-c.1450 (1988), ch. 6 (E)
* R. Martin, 'The two cities in Augustine's political philosophy', Journal of the History of Ideas, 33
        (1972), 195-216 (E)

J. von Heyking, 'A headless body politic? Augustine's understanding of populus and its
        representation', History of Political Thought, 20 (1999) (E)
*P. Weithman, 'Augustine's political philosophy', in The Cambridge Companion to Augustine, ed.
        E. Stump and N. Kretzmann (2001), pp. 234-52 (E)
*J. Wetzel ed., Augustine's 'City of God': A critical guide (Cambridge 2012) (E)

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)
P.R.L. Brown, 'Saint Augustine', in B. Smalley, ed., Trends in Medieval Political Thought (1965)
———, Augustine of Hippo (1967)
H. Chadwick, The Early Church (1967), ch. 15
———, Augustine (1986) (E)
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
G.J. Lavere, 'The political realism of Saint Augustine', Augustinian Studies, 11(1980), 135-44
———, 'The influence of Saint Augustine on early medieval political theory', (E)
        Augustinian Studies, 12 (1981), 1-10 (E)
R.A. Markus, 'Saint Augustine's views on the just war', Studies in Church History, 20 (1983), 1-13
P. Ramsey, 'The just war according to St Augustine' in J.B. Elshtain, ed., Just War Theory (1992)
J. Rist, Augustine (1994) (E)
R. Williams, 'Politics and the soul: a reading of the City of God', Milltown Studies 19 (1987)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How did Augustine's conception of a city (*civitas*) serve his purposes in *The City of God*? (2020)

What was the role of love in Augustine's political thought? (2019)

'There is nothing so sociable by nature and anti-social by corruption as man.' What makes political life possible for Augustine? (2018)

Why did Augustine think that fallen human beings were characterised by a 'lust for domination', and what were the consequences of this for human social and political life? (2017)

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)

A4 AQUINAS

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Set text:

Thomas Aquinas, <u>Political Writings</u>, trans. R. W. Dyson (Cambridge, 2002) (E)

Secondary reading:

<u>Abbreviation:</u>
CHLMP: N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, J. Pinborg, and E. Stumb eds., <u>The Cambridge History</u>
 <u>of Later Medieval Philosophy</u> (1982) (E)

<u>Suggested secondary reading:</u>
J. Barnes, 'The just war', in CHLMP, ch. 41 (E)
J.M. Blythe, <u>Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages</u> (1992), pp. 39-59
(E)
* ———, 'Introduction' to Ptolemy of Lucca, <u>On the Government of Rulers, With Portions</u>
 <u>Attributed to Thomas Aquinas</u>, trans. Blythe (1997) [not available online; but see J. Blythe,
 The Life and Works of Tolomeo Fiadoni (Ptolemy of Lucca) (2009), ch. 7 'De regimine
 principum'. (E)]
*J.P. Canning, <u>A History of Medieval Political Thought 300-1450</u> (1996), ch. 3 (E)
J. Coleman, <u>A History of Political Thought: From the Middle Ages to the Renaissance</u> (2000), ch. 2
J. Finnis, <u>Aquinas: Moral, Political, and Legal Theory</u> (Oxford, 1998), chs 7, 8
M. Keys, <u>Aquinas, Aristotle and the promise of the common good</u> (Cambridge 2008) (E)
*D.E. Luscombe, 'Natural morality and natural law', in CHLMP, ch. 37 (E)
* ———, 'The state of nature and the origin of the state', in CHLMP, ch. 40 (E)
A.S. McGrade, 'Rights, natural rights, and the philosophy of law', in CHLMP, ch. 39 (E)
W. Ullmann, 'The medieval Papacy, St. Thomas and beyond', in Ullmann, <u>Law and Tradition</u>
 <u>in the Middle Ages</u> (1988)

<u>Further secondary reading:</u>
A. Black, <u>Political Thought in Europe 1250-1450</u> (1992), ch. 1 (E)
J.M. Blythe, 'Aristotle's *Politics* and Ptolemy of Lucca', *Vivarium* 40/1 (2002), 103-136 (E)
M.B. Crowe, 'St Thomas and Ulpian's natural law', in A.A. Maurer, ed., <u>St Thomas Aquinas 1274-</u>
 <u>1974: Commemorative Studies</u> (2 vols; 1974), vol. I, pp. 261-282
B. Davies, <u>The Thought of Thomas Aquinas</u> (1992) (E)
J. Dunbabin, 'The reception and interpretation of Aristotle's <u>Politics</u>', in CHLMP, ch. 38 (E)
L.P. Fitzgerald, 'St Thomas Aquinas and the two powers', <u>Angelicum</u>, 56 (1979), 515-56
E. Gilson, <u>The Christian Philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas</u> (1957), pt III, chs 3-5
———, <u>A History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages</u> (1955)
A. Kenny, <u>Aquinas</u> (Oxford 1980)
A. de Libera, <u>La philosophie médiévale</u> (2nd edn, 1995), esp. pp. 355-418
D.E. Luscombe, 'Thomas Aquinas and Conceptions of Hierarchy in the Thirteenth Century', in
 <u>Thomas von Aquin</u>, ed. A. Zimmerman (1988), pp. 261-77
J. Porter, <u>Nature as reason. A Thomistic theory of the natural law</u> (Grand Rapids 2005)
A. Parel, 'Aquinas' theory of property', in A. Parel and T. Flanagan, eds, <u>Theories of Property</u>
 (1979)

R. Pasnau, <u>Thomas Aquinas on Human Nature: A Philosophical Study of Summa Theologiae, 1a 75-89</u> (2002) (E)
F. van Steenberghen, <u>Thomas Aquinas and Radical Aristotelianism</u> (1980)
D. Westberg, <u>Right Practical Reason: Aristotle, Action and Prudence in Aquinas</u> (1994)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What were the limits of political life according to Aquinas? (2020)

What value did Thomas Aquinas attribute to political life? (2019)

'The secular power is subject to the spiritual power as the body is to the soul.' Should we be surprised by Aquinas' statement? (2018)

What were the ends of law in the political thought of Thomas Aquinas? (2017)

What was the role of nature in Thomas Aquinas's political theory? (2016)

A5 MORE

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Set text:

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

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

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
*D. Baker-Smith, More's 'Utopia' (1991; repr. 2000) (E)
D. Bevington, 'The dialogue in Utopia: two sides to the question', Studies in Philology, 58 (1961),
496- 509 (E)
*B. Bradshaw, 'More on Utopia', Historical Journal, 24 (1981), 1-27 (E)
D. Fenlon, 'England and Europe: Utopia and its aftermath', Transactions of the Royal Historical
Society, fifth series, 25 (1975), 115-35 (E)
J.H. Hexter and E. Surtz, 'Introduction', in More, Utopia, eds J.H. Hexter and E. Surtz
(The Complete Works of St Thomas More, vol. IV) (1965)
J.H. Hexter, 'Thomas More: on the margins of modernity', Journal of British Studies, 1 (1961), 20-
37 (E)
*E. Nelson, 'Greek nonsense in More's Utopia', Historical Journal, 44 (2001), 889-918 (E)
Q. Skinner, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought (2 vols; 1978), pp. 213-21, 255-62 (E)
*———, 'Sir Thomas More's Utopia and the language of Renaissance humanism', in The
Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe, ed. A. Pagden (1987), pp. 123-57
(E); rev. in Skinner, Visions of Politics (3 vols; 2002), vol. II: Renaissance Virtues, ch. 8 (E)
R. Tuck, 'Humanism and Political Thought', in A. Goodman and A. Mackay eds., The impact
of humanism Western Europe (1990) (E)
T.I. White, 'Pride and the public good: Thomas More's use of Plato in Utopia', Journal of the
History of Philosophy, 22 (1982), 329-54 (E)

Further secondary reading:
R.P. Adams, The Better Part of Valor: More, Erasmus, Colet and Vives on Humanism,
War, and Peace, 1496-1535 (1962)
A.A. Cave, 'Thomas More and the New World', Albion, 23 (1991), 209-29
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
———, 'Utopia': An Elusive Vision (1993)
A. Fox and J. Guy, eds, Reassessing the Henrician Age (1986), pt I
J. Guy, Thomas More (2000)
J.H. Hexter, 'The loom of language and the fabric of imperatives: the case of Il Principe and
Utopia', in Hexter, The Vision of Politics on the Eve of the Reformation (1973)
G.M. Logan, The Meaning of More's 'Utopia' (1983) (E)
J.M. Parrish, 'A new source for More's Utopia', Historical Journal, 40 (1997), 493-98 (E)

J. Romm, 'More's strategy of naming in the <u>Utopia</u>', <u>Sixteenth Century Journal</u>, 22 (1991), 173-83 (E)

G.B. Wegemer, <u>Young Thomas More and the Arts of Liberty</u> (Cambridge 2011) (E)

D. Wootton, 'Introduction', to More, <u>Utopia: With Erasmus's 'The Sileni of Alcibiades'</u> (1999)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How far is Utopia's 'equal and just distribution of goods' the expression of a democratic ideal? (2020)

Are the politics of the 'new island' of Utopia as virtuous as Raphael Hythloday suggests? (2019)

What answers does More's Utopia offer to the question of the best form of government? (2018)

What is the significance of More's suggestion that Utopia might represent 'The best state of the commonwealth'? (2017)

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

A6 MACHIAVELLI

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Set texts:

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

Secondary reading:

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

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 (E)
*F. Gilbert, Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Italy (1984 edn)
        (E)
*J. M. Najemy ed., The Cambridge companion to Machiavelli (Cambridge 2010) (E)
R. Price, 'The senses of virtú in Machiavelli', European Studies Review, 3 (1973), 315-45 (E)
———, 'The theme of gloria in Machiavelli', Renaissance Quarterly, 30 (1977), 588-631
*Q. Skinner, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought (2 vols; 1978), vol. I, ch. 5 (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)
*M. Viroli, 'Machiavelli and the republican idea of politics', in Bock, ch. 7 (E)
———, Machiavelli (1998) (E)

Further secondary reading:
J. Jackson Barlow, 'The fox and the lion: Machiavelli replies to Cicero', History of Political Thought,
        20 (1999), 627-45 (E)
J. Coleman, 'Machiavelli's Via Moderna: Medieval and Renaissance Attitudes to History', in
        Niccolò Machiavelli's The Prince: New interdisciplinary essays, ed. M. Coyle (1995), pp. 40-
        64
V. Cox, 'Machiavelli and the Rhetorica ad Herennium: deliberative rhetoric in The Prince',
        Sixteenth Century Journal, 28 (1997), 1109-1141 (E)
F. Gilbert, 'Bernardo Rucellai and the Orti Oricellari: a study on the origin of modern political
        thought', in Gilbert, History: Choice and Commitment (1977) (E)
P. Godman, From Poliziano to Machiavelli: Florentine Humanism in the High Renaissance (1998)
J.H. Hexter, 'Il Principe and lo stato', in The Vision of Politics on the Eve of the Reformation (1973)
        (E)
M. Hörnqvist, Machiavelli and Empire (2005), chs 2-4 (E)
J.M. Najemy, 'Machiavelli on the Necessity of Interpreting Religion', Journal of the History of
        Ideas, 60 (1999), 659–8 (E)
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)
N. Rubinstein, 'Machiavelli and Florentine republican experience', in Bock, ch. 1 (E)

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

———, 'Political philosophy', in C.B. Schmitt and Q. Skinner, eds, The Cambridge History
    of Renaissance Philosophy (1988), ch. 8, esp. pp. 408-42 (E)

D.J. Wilcox, The Development of Florentine Humanist Historiography in the 15th Century (1969)

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

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What importance does Machiavelli attribute to law? (2020)

What best explains Machiavelli's insistence that both principalities and republics should look to antiquity for political examples? (2019)

What follows from Machiavelli's contention that, 'In every republic there are two different dispositions, that of the populace and that of the upper class' [MACHIAVELLI, Discourses on Livy, Book I]? (2018)

Which did Machiavelli value more: glory or liberty? (2017)

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)

A7 HOBBES

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

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)

Secondary reading:

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

Suggested secondary reading:
M.M. Goldsmith, 'Hobbes on law', in Sorell, Companion, ch. 11 (E)
K. Hoekstra, 'The de facto turn in Hobbes's political philosophy', in T. Sorell and L. Foisneau (eds.),
        Leviathan After 350 Years (2004) (E)
_____, 'Hobbesian equality', in S. Lloyd ed., Hobbes today (Cambridge 2013) (E)
  *N. Malcolm, Aspects of Hobbes (Oxford 2002), esp. chs 1, 2, 5, and 13 (E)
J.G.A. Pocock, 'Time, history and eschatology in the thought of Thomas Hobbes', in Pocock,
        Politics, Language and Time (1972), pp. 148-201
* D. Runciman, Pluralism and the Personality of the State (Cambridge 1997), ch. 2 (E)
Q. Skinner, Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes (Cambridge 1996) (E)
_____, 'Hobbes on representation,' European Journal of Philosophy 13 (2005), 155-184 (E)
*   ____, Hobbes and republican liberty (Cambridge 2008) (M – chapter 2 only)
* J. Sommerville, Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context (1992) (M – chapter 1 only)
P. Springborg ed., The Cambridge companion to Hobbes's 'Leviathan' (Cambridge 2007) (E)
R. Tuck, Hobbes (Oxford 1989) (E)
_____, 'Hobbes and democracy', and reply by K. Hoekstra, 'A lion in the house', both in A.S.
        Brett and J. Tully eds., Rethinking the foundations of modern political thought (Cambridge
        2006) (E)

Further secondary reading:
D. Baumgold, Hobbes's Political Theory (1988)
      _____, Contract theory in historical context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke (Leiden
        2010) (E)
D. Boonin-Vail, Thomas Hobbes and the Science of Moral Virtue (Cambridge1994)
C. Condren, Thomas Hobbes (Twayne 2000)
R. Harrison, Hobbes, Locke, and Confusion's Masterpiece (Cambridge 2003) (E)
D. Johnston, The Rhetoric of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes and the Politics of Cultural
        Transformation (1986)
S. Lloyd, Ideals as interests in Hobbes's 'Leviathan' (Cambridge 1992) (E)
N. Malcolm, Thomas Hobbes. Leviathan (Oxford 2012), vol. I: Introduction (E)
M. Oakeshott, 'Introduction to Leviathan' [1946], in Hobbes on Civil Association (1975), ch. 1
A. Ryan, 'Hobbes's political philosophy', in Sorell, Companion, ch. 9 (E)
J. Scott, 'The peace of silence: Thucydides and the English Civil War', in T. Sorell and G.A.J. Rogers
        eds., Hobbes and History (Routledge 2000)
Q. Skinner, 'Conquest and consent: Thomas Hobbes and the Engagement controversy',
        in G.E. Aylmer ed., The Interregnum (1972); rev. in Skinner, Visions, ch. 10 (E)

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

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

_____, 'Introduction' to <u>Leviathan</u>, ed. R. Tuck (1996; replaces the 1991 introduction)

W. von Leyden, <u>Hobbes and Locke: The Politics of Freedom and Obligation</u> (1981)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

'For in a way beset with those that content, on one side for too great Liberty, and on the other side for too much Authority, 'tis hard to passe between the points of both unwounded' [THOMAS HOBBES, Leviathan, Dedicatory Epistle]. Discuss. (2020)

Why was Hobbes in Leviathan so insistent upon correct speech? (2019)

What role does consent play in Thomas Hobbes' Leviathan? (2018)

Why was Hobbes in Leviathan so insistent upon the 'proper signification' of liberty? (2017)

'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)

A8 LOCKE

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Set texts:

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

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

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

<u>Suggested additional primary reading:</u>

<u>John Locke: Political Essays</u>, ed. M. Goldie (1997) (E)

Secondary reading:

<u>Suggested secondary reading:</u>
D. Armitage, 'John Locke, Carolina and the <u>Two treatises of government</u>', <u>Political Theory</u> 32
      (2004), 602-27 (E)
R. Ashcraft, 'Revolutionary politics and Locke's <u>Two Treatises</u>', <u>Political Theory</u>, 8 (1980), 429-86
      (E)
D. Baumgold, <u>Contract theory in historical context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke</u> (Leiden
      2010)
J. Dunn, <u>The Political Thought of John Locke</u> (1969) (E)
———, 'The claim to freedom of conscience: freedom of speech, freedom of thought,
      freedom of worship?', in O.P. Grell et al., eds, <u>From Persecution to Toleration</u> (1991) (E)
*M. Goldie, 'Introduction', to John Locke, <u>Two Treatises of Government</u> (Everyman, 1993) (M)
*J. Marshall, <u>John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility</u> (1994), esp. ch. 6 (E)
J. Scott, <u>England's Troubles</u> (2000), ch. 16 (E)
J. Scott, 'The law of war: Grotius, Sidney, Locke and the political theory of rebellion',
      <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 13 (1992), 565-85 (E)
J. Tully, <u>A Discourse on Property</u> (1980) (E)
*———, <u>An Approach to Political Theory: Locke in Contexts</u> (1993), esp. ch. 1 (E)
J. Waldron, <u>God, Locke, and Equality</u> (2002) (E)

<u>Further secondary reading:</u>
R. Ashcraft, <u>John Locke's Two Treatises of Government</u> (1987)
H. Dawson, 'Locke on language in (civil) society', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 24 (2005) (E)
J. Dunn, 'What is living and what is dead in the political theory of John Locke?', in Dunn,
      <u>Interpreting Political Responsibility</u> (1990) (E)
M. Goldie, 'John Locke and Anglican Royalism', <u>Political Studies</u>, 31 (1983), 61-85 (E)
R. Grant, <u>John Locke's Liberalism</u> (1987)
I. Harris, <u>The Mind of John Locke</u> (1994)

D.A. Lloyd Thomas, <u>Locke on Government</u> (1995) (E)
C.B. Macpherson, <u>The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism</u> (1962), pt IV
K. Olivekrona, 'Appropriation in the state of nature', in J. Lively and A. Reeve, eds,
   <u>Modern Political Theory from Hobbes to Marx</u> (1989)
A.J. Simmons, <u>On the Edge of Anarchy: Locke, Consent and the Limits of Society</u> (1993) (E)
N. Tarcov, <u>Locke's Education for Liberty</u> (1984)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What is the role of the 'Appeal to Heaven' in Locke's political thought? (2020)

What is the effect on Locke's politics of his conviction that we are on this earth to fulfil God's purposes? (2019)

To what extent does Locke's argument in Two Treatises of Government depend on the concept of trust? (2018)

Why was Locke so favourable to prerogative and executive power? (2017)

'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)

B9. GREEK DEMOCRACY AND ITS CRITICS

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Primary reading:

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

Suggested primary reading:
Herodotus, <u>Histories</u>, bk III. 80-3 [in EGPT] (E)
Ps-Xenophon (the Old Oligarch), 'Constitution of Athens' [in EGPT] (E)
Aristophanes, <u>The Knights</u> [many editions, but see <u>Acharnians; Knights</u>, ed. by J. Henderson
      (2014) (E)]
Isocrates, 'Panegyricus' (vol. I); 'Areopagiticus', 'Antidosis' (vol. II); 'Against Callimachus'(vol. III),
      all in <u>Isocrates</u>, Loeb Classical Library (3 vols; 1961-1968) (E) [search for 'Isocrates
      Harvard' on *iDiscover*.
Thucydides, <u>History</u>, bk II. 35-46, 60-64, bk III. 37-48 [in EGPT] (E)
Euripides, <u>Suppliant Maidens</u>, ll. 399-456 [in EGPT] (E)
Plato, <u>Protagoras</u>, 320-8; <u>Gorgias</u>; <u>Republic</u>, bks VI, VIII [For the *Republic*, see A1 Plato; for
      Protagoras, see <u>Laches; Protagoras; Meno; Euthydemus</u>, ed. by W.R.M. Lamb, (2014) (E);
      and for *Gorgias*, see <u>Lysis; Symposium; Gorgias</u>, ed. by W.R.M. Lamb (2014) (E)
Aristotle, <u>Politics</u>, bks III-VI [see A2 Aristotle].

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
J. Dunn, <u>Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future</u> (2nd edn, 1993), ch. 1
———, ed., <u>Democracy: The Unfinished Journey</u> (1992)
C. Farrar, <u>The Origins of Democratic Thinking</u> (1988) (E)
M.I. Finley, 'Athenian Demagogues', <u>Past and Present</u>, 21 (1962), 3-24 (E)
M.H. Hansen, <u>Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes</u> (1991, 1999), esp. chs 1, 13 (E)
K. Hoekstra, 'Athenian democracy and popular tyranny', in R. Bourke ed., <u>Popular sovereignty
      in historical perspective </u>(Cambridge 2016) (E)
*M. Lane, <u>Greek and Roman Political Ideas</u> (Pelican 2014); available online in its American edition
      under the title, <u>The Birth of Politics: Eight Greek and Roman political ideas and why they
      matter</u>, (2015) (E); 'Introduction' to British edition available on Moodle (M).
      _____, 'Popular sovereignty as control of office-holders: Aristotle on Greek democracy', in
      Bourke ed., <u>Popular sovereignty</u> (as for Hoekstra) (E)
C. Meier, <u>The Greek Discovery of Politics</u> (1990)
J. Miller, 'Warning the Demos: Political Communication with a Democratic Audience
      in Demosthenes', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 23 (2002), 401-17 (E)
*J. Ober, <u>Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule </u>(1998) (E)
*J. Ober and C. Hedrick eds, <u>Dēmokratia: A conversation on democracies ancient and modern</u>
      (1986)
R. Osborne, <u>Athens and Athenian Democracy</u> (2010)
A. Saxonhouse, <u>Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens</u> (2008) (E)
D. Scott, 'Plato's critique of the democratic character', <u>Phronesis</u>, 45 (2000), 19-37 (E)
G. de Ste Croix, <u>The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World</u> (1981; rev. 1983), ch. 7 & appdx IV

*B.S. Strauss, 'On Aristotle's critique of Athenian democracy', in C. Lord and
      D.K. O'Connor, eds, <u>Essays on the Foundations of Aristotelian Political Science</u> (1991) (M)

<u>Further secondary reading:</u>
D.S. Allen, <u>The World of Prometheus: the politics of punishing in democratic Athens</u> (1999)
         , <u>Why Plato Wrote</u> (2010) (E)
J.P. Euben, J.R. Wallach and J. Ober, eds, <u>Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction</u>
      <u>of American Democracy</u> (1994) (E)
M.I. Finley, <u>Democracy Ancient and Modern</u> (2nd edn, 1985) (E)
M.H. Hansen, <u>Was Athens a Democracy?</u> (1989)
J. Ober, <u>Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens</u> (1989) (E)
         , <u>Democracy and Knowledge: Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens</u> (2008) (E)
K. Raaflaub et al. eds., <u>Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece</u> (2007) (E)
J.T. Roberts, <u>Athens on Trial: The Antidemocratic Tradition in Western Thought</u> (1994)
P. Rose, <u>Sons of the Gods, Children of the Earth</u> (1992), esp. pp. 246-65
P. Vidal-Naquet, <u>Democracy Ancient and Modern</u> (1995), esp. pp. 82-140
B. Williams, <u>Shame and Necessity</u> (1988)
H. Yunis, <u>Taming Democracy</u> (1996) (E)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What threatened the stability of democratic government in the differing opinions of its advocates and detractors? (2020)

Were the disagreements between proponents and opponents of Athenian democracy essentially about equality? (2019)

What, if anything, united critics of Athenian democracy? (2018)

'Critics of Athenian democracy owed the fundamentals of their arguments to the very political system that they opposed.' Discuss. (2017)

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

B10. ROMAN POLITICAL THOUGHT FROM THE REPUBLIC TO THE PRINCIPATE

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Suggested primary reading

Cicero, <u>On Duties</u>, trans. M. Atkins and M. Griffin (Cambridge, 1991) [unavailable online, but see ed. by W. Miller (2014) (E)
Cicero, <u>On the commonwealth</u> and <u>On the laws</u>, in <u>De re publica</u>, trans. J. Zetzel (Cambridge, 1995) (E); or <u>The Republic; and The Laws</u>, trans. N. Rudd (Oxford, 1998)
Seneca, <u>On mercy</u> and <u>On the private life</u>, in <u>Seneca. Moral and political essays</u>, ed. J.M. Cooper and J.F. Procopé (Cambridge, 1995) [not available online, but see the three-volume Loeb Classical library edition of Seneca's <u>Moral Essays</u>. <u>On mercy</u> = <u>de Clementia</u> (vol. 1); <u>On the private life</u> = <u>de Otio</u> (vol. 2). (E) (Search 'Seneca Harvard').
Sallust, <u>The war with Catiline</u> and <u>The war with Jugurtha</u>, Loeb Classical Library (1921) (E)
Livy, <u>Ab urbe condita</u>, Loeb Classical Library (1919-67): bk I, chaps 24, 57; II, 32; III, 44; VIII, 28. (E)
Tacitus, <u>Annals</u>, Loeb Classical Library (1925-1937): bk I, 1-15; II, 27-36; III, 26-8; 52-70; IV, 1-22; 28-35; 42; VI, 8; 13; 22. (E)

Secondary reading

Abbreviations:
CHGRPT: C. Rowe and M. Schofield (eds), <u>The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought</u> (Cambridge, 2000) (E)
<u>Justice and Generosity</u>: A. Laks and M. Schofield (eds), <u>Justice and Generosity</u> (Cambridge, 1995) (E)

Suggested secondary reading:
J. Connolly, <u>The life of Roman republicanism</u> (Princeton 2014) (E)
M. Griffin, 'Seneca and Pliny', in CHGRPT, pp. 532-58. (E)
*A.A. Long, 'Cicero's politics in *De officiis*', in <u>Justice and Generosity</u>, pp. 213-40. (E)
*M. Schofield, 'Cicero's definition of *res publica*' in J.G.F. Powell (ed.), <u>Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers</u> (Oxford, 1995), pp. 63-83. (M)
*P. Stacey, <u>Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince</u> (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 23-72. (E)
T.E.J. Wiedemann, 'Reflections of Roman political thought in Latin historical writing', in CHGRPT, pp. 517-31. (E)
———, 'Sallust's *Jugurtha*: concord, discord, and the digressions', <u>Greece and Rome</u>, 40, pp. 48-56. (E)

Further secondary reading:
J. Annas, 'Cicero on Stoic moral philosophy and private property', in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds), <u>Philosophia Togata: essays on philosophy and Roman society</u> (Oxford, 1989)
E.M. Atkins, '*Domina et regina virtutum*: justice and *societas* in De officiis', <u>Phronesis</u>, 35 (1990), 258-89. (E)
———, 'Cicero', in CHGRPT, pp. 477-516 (E)
D. Hoyos ed., <u>A companion to Roman imperialism</u> (Brill 2013), ch. by Stevenson and Adler (E)
J. Richardson, <u>The Language of Empire. Rome and the Idea of Empire from the Third Century B.C. to the Second Century A.D.</u> (Cambridge 2009) (E)

M. Schofield, 'Epicurean and Stoic political thought', in CHGRPT, pp. 435-56. (E)
———, 'Two Stoic approaches to justice', in <u>Justice and Generosity</u>, pp. 191-212. (E)
———, <u>Saving the City: Philosopher-Kings and Other Classical Paradigms</u> (London, 1999), ch. 10.

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Did virtue remain the central concept in Roman political thinking despite mutation of Rome's constitutional form? (2020)

How did the advent of the Principate affect Roman political thought? (2019)

'The principal preoccupation of Roman political thought became the control of passions by reason.' Discuss. (2018)

'To what extent did the advent of the Principate alter Roman thinking about political virtue? (2017)

Was Roman political thought intrinsically imperialist? (2016)

B11. EARLY CHRISTIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

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 in this edition, but see the trans. by M.F. McDonald (1955) (E)].

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

Ambrose, Letter 17 (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 Letters 17, 21, 51, and the
 Sermon against Auxentius, are also easily 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 in these editions, but see 1881
 edition available from Project Gutenberg (E)]

Augustine, The City of God, trans. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge, 1998), bks 2-5, 8, 19. [see A3 Augustine]

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]]

Secondary reading

Abbreviation:

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

Suggested secondary reading:

T.D. Barnes, Tertullian. A historical and literary study (Oxford, 1971; reissued 1985)

*H. Chadwick, 'Christian doctrine', in CHMPT, pp. 11-20. (E)

H. Chadwick, The Early Church (London, 1968)

*M. Colish, 'Cicero, Ambrose and Stoic Ethics: Transmission or Transformation?', in A.S. Bernardo
 and S. Levin (eds), The Classics in the Middle Ages: Papers of the Annual Conference of the
 Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies (1990), 95-112.

*R.A. Markus, Saeculum. History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine (rev. ed., Cambridge,
 1988) (E)

———, 'The Latin Fathers', CHMPT, pp. 92-122. (E)

*F. Young, 'Christianity', in C. Rowe and M. Schofield (eds), The Cambridge History of Greek
 and Roman Political Thought (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 635-660. (E)

Further secondary reading:

H.X. Arquillière, L'Augustinisme Politique. Essai sur la formation des théories politiques au moyen
 âge (2nd ed., Paris, 1972).

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

J.F. Childress, 'Moral Discourse about War in the Early Church,' in The Journal of Religious Ethics
    37, no. 1 (2009), 131-58. (E)
M. Colish, The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages, 2 vols
    (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 34-5, 1985)
F. Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Theory. Origins and Background
    (2 vols, Washington, 1966), vol. 2.
B. McGinn, 'The development of Christian theologies of history' and 'The exegesis of the
    Apocalypse in Latin Christianity', both in McGinn, The Calabrian Abbot: Joachim of Fiore in
    the History of Western Thought (New York/London, 1985)
N. McLynn, Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital (Berkeley, London, 1994) (E)
L.J. Swift, 'St Ambrose on Violence and War,' in Transactions and Proceedings of the American
    Philosophical Association, 101 (1970), 533-43. (E)

And see above, A3, under Augustine.

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What were the political consequences of the rejection of classical ethics in early Christian thought? (2020)

In what ways did early Christian political thinkers subvert classical thought? (2019)

What significance did classical virtue have for early Christian political theorists? (2018)

How did early Christian writers respond to Roman conceptions of citizenship? (2017)

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

B12. TEMPORAL AND SPIRITUAL IN MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THOUGHT

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Suggested primary reading

Bernard of Clairvaux, Five Books on Consideration, trans. J.D. Anderson and E.T. Keenan
　　　(Cistercian Fathers Series 37) (Kalamazoo, 1976) [not online, but see trans. by G. Lewis
　　　(1908) at https://archive.org/details/bernarddeclirvau00bernuoft/page/n4/mode/2up]

Innocent III, selections from Venerabilem and Novit, in B. Tierney, The crisis of church and state
　　　(Toronto 1988), pp. 133-8.
Innocent IV, selections from commentary on Novit and Quod super his, in Tierney, Crisis, pp. 153-6.
Hostiensis, selections from commentary on Per venerabilem and Solitae, in Tierney, Crisis, pp. 156-
　　　7.

[Tierney's collection is not available online, and it is not easy to identify a ready substitute. Some
　　　relevant selections can be found in the following resource from Fordham University:
　　　https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/sbook1l.asp].

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

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

Marsilius of Padua, The Defender of the Peace, Discourse II, trans A. Brett (Cambridge, 2005) (E)
　　　or A. Gewirth (1956, repr. 2001), chapters 2-11, 15-18, 20-26, 29-30.

Secondary reading

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

Suggested secondary reading:
J.P. Canning, Ideas of power in the late middle ages 1296-1417 (Cambridge 2011) (E)
J.R. Eastman, "Giles of Rome and Celestine V: The Franciscan Revolution and the Theology of
　　　Abdication", The Catholic Historical Review, 76, 1990: 195–211 (E)
G.S. Garnett, Marsilius of Padua and 'the Truth of History' (Oxford, 2006) (E)
D. Luscombe, 'Hierarchy in the late middle ages', in J.P. Canning and O.-G. Oexle (eds),
　　　Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages (Göttingen, 1998), pp. 113-
　　　26.
K. Pennington, 'Law, legislation and government, 1150-1300', in CHMPT, pp. 444-53. (E)
B. Tierney, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory (Cambridge, 1955) (E)
W. Ullmann, Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages (4th ed., London 1978), pp.
　　　231-79.
J.A. Watt, 'Spiritual and temporal powers', in CHMPT, pp. 367-423. (E)

Further secondary reading:

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

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

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

J. Rivière, <u>Le Problème de l'Église et de l'État au Temps de Philippe le Bel</u> (Louvain/Paris, 1926), pp. 191-227.

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

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

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

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

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

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

'Incompatible conceptions of the Church were the main driver of political disagreement about secular and papal power.' Discuss. (2020)

'The debates over the relationship between secular and papal power in the decades around 1300 turned principally on the concept of nature.' Discuss. (2019)

Account for the differing significance attributed to sin by political polemicists around 1300. (2018)

To what extent was the disagreement between pro- and anti-papal writers in the Middle Ages a disagreement about jurisdictional claims? (2017)

'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)

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

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Suggested primary reading

John of Salisbury, <u>Policraticus</u>, ed. and trans. C.J. Nederman (Cambridge, 1990) (E)
Albert the Great, 'Questions on Book X of the Ethics', in A.S. McGrade et al. eds.,
<u>The Cambridge Translations of Medieval Philosophical Texts</u>, Vol. II: <u>Ethics and political philosophy</u>
    (Cambridge 2001) (E)
Thomas Aquinas, <u>On the government of princes</u> (= <u>On kingdom</u>), in <u>Political Writings</u>,
    trans. R. W. Dyson (Cambridge, 2002) (E)
Giles of Rome, 'On the Rule of Princes', in <u>Cambridge Translations</u>, as above (E)
Ptolemy of Lucca, <u>On the Government of Rulers, With Portions Attributed to Thomas Aquinas</u>,
    trans. J. M. Blythe (1997) [not available online]
Peter of Auvergne, 'Commentary and Questions on Book III of Aristotle's Politics (selections)',
    in <u>Cambridge Translations</u>, as above (E)
Dante, <u>Monarchy</u>, ed. P. Shaw (Cambridge, 1996) (E)
Marsilius of Padua, <u>The defender of the peace</u>, Discourse I, trans A. Brett (Cambridge, 2005) (E)
    or A. Gewirth (1956, repr. 2001)

Secondary reading

Abbreviations:
CHLMP = N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, J. Pinborg, and E. Stump eds., <u>The Cambridge History</u>
    <u>of Later Medieval Philosophy</u> (1982) (E)
CHMPT = J.H. Burns (ed.), <u>The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350-c.1450</u>
    (Cambridge, 1988) (E)
Weijers and Holt = O. Weijers and L.Holtz eds., <u>L'enseignement des disciplines à la Faculté des</u>
    <u>Arts (Paris et Oxford)</u> (Turnhout: Brepols 1997)

Suggested secondary reading:
A.S. Brett, 'Issues in translating the Defensor pacis', in G. Moreno-Riaño ed., <u>The world of Marsilius</u>
    <u>of Padua</u> (Turnhout: Brepols 2006) (E)
A. Celano, <u>Aristotle's Ethics and medieval philosophy</u> (Cambridge 2016) (E)
J. Dunbabin, 'The reception and interpretation of Aristotle's <u>Politics</u>', in CHLMP, ch. 38 (E)
D.E. Luscombe and G.R. Evans, 'The twelfth-century Renaissance', in CHMPT, ch. 12 (E)

C.J. Nederman, 'Nature, sin and the origins of society: the Ciceronian tradition
    in medieval political thought', <u>Journal of the History of Ideas</u>, 49 (1988), 3-26 (E)
C.J. Nederman and J. Bruckmann, 'Aristotelianism in John of Salisbury's <u>Policraticus</u>',
    <u>Journal of the History of Philosophy</u>, 21 (1983), 203-229 (E)
L. Peterman, 'Dante's <u>Monarchy</u> and Aristotle's political thought', <u>Studies in Medieval</u>
    <u>and Renaissance History</u> 10 (1973), 1-40 (E)
V. Syros, 'The sovereignty of the multitude in the works of Marsilius of Padua, Peter of Auvergne
    and some other Aristotelian commentators', in <u>The world of Marsilius of Padua</u>, as above (E)

Further secondary reading:
J. Aertsen and A. Speer eds., <u>Was ist Philosophie im Mittalter? / What is Philosophy in the Middle</u>
    <u>Ages?</u> (Berlin 1998 = Miscellanea Mediaevalia 26) (E)

I. Bejczy and C.Nederman eds., Princely virtues in the middle ages (2007)
J.M. Blythe, 'Aristotle's *Politics* and Ptolemy of Lucca', *Vivarium* 40/1 (2002), 103-136 (E)
_____, The worldview and thought of Tolomeo Fiadoni (Ptolemy of Lucca) (Brepols 2013) (E)
C. Flüeler, L. Lanza and M. Toste eds., Peter of Auvergne: University master of the 13th century
(Berlin 2015) (E)
C. Lohr, 'The new Aristotle and "science" in the Paris arts faculty', in Weijers and Holtz
D. Luscombe, 'Commentaries on the Politics', in Weijers and Holtz
G. Moreno Riaño and C. Nederman eds., A companion to Marsilius of Padua (2011) (E)

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):

Did the reception of classical thought in the medieval period lead to a greater emphasis on the importance of political participation? (2020)

How did the recovery of the classical vocabulary of politics change the way medieval philosophers thought about monarchy? (2019)

What impact did classical notions of human nature have on medieval political thought? (2018)

To what extent did the recovery of classical conceptions of nature allow medieval thinkers to develop a political philosophy that was independent of theology? (2017)

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

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

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Primary reading

Suggested primary reading (not on Camtools):
The Digest of Justinian, ed. T. Mommsen and P. Krueger, trans. A. Watson (4 vols; Philadelphia, 1985) (E): vol. I: Constitutions 'Deo Auctore', 'Tanta', 'Omnem', pp. xlvi-lxiv, and bk I, titles 1-4, pp. 1-14.

Justinian's Institutes, trans. P. Birks and G. McLeod (London, 1987), 1.1, 1.2 [not available in this
    edition online, but see trans. J.B. Moyle, 5th ed., (1913), available via Project Gutenberg (E)].
    Part of the introduction to the Birks and McLeod edition is available on Moodle (M).
The Code of Justinian, in The Civil Law, trans. S.P. Scott, titles: 1.1.1; 1.14.1; 8.52(53) 2.
    [not available online]

Suggested primary reading (on Moodle)*:
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.
Bartolus of Sassoferrato, *On the Governance of a City*, *On Guelfs and Ghibellines*, *On the Tyrant*,
    trans. M. Ryan and G. Garnett.
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*.
Guillaume Budé: Selections from his commentary on D. 1.3.31 and his *Livre de l'institution du
    prince*.
Jacques Cujas: Selections from his *Observationes* on C. 6.23.3 and 6.32.3.

* These readings may change from time to time. A selection drawn from the texts above will be
    made available on Moodle and in lecture handouts. It is essential to attend Dr Ryan's
    lectures if studying for this topic.

Secondary reading

Abbreviations:
 CHMPT: J.H. Burns (ed.), <u>The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350-c.1450</u>
    (Cambridge, 1988) (E)
TRHS: <u>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (</u>E)

Suggested secondary reading:
*J.P. Canning, 'Law, sovereignty and corporation theory, 1300-1450', in CHMPT, pp. 454-76. (E)
* ———, <u>Ideas of power in the late middle ages 1296-1417</u> (Cambridge 2011), Ch. 5. (E)
*K. Pennington, 'Law, legislative authority, and theories of government, 1150-1300',
    CHMPT, ch. 15. (E)
* ———, <u>The Prince and the Law, 1200-1600</u> (Princeton, 1993), chapters 1-3, 6. (E)
*M. Ryan, 'Bartolus of Sassoferrato and free cities', TRHS, 6th series, 10 (2000), 65-89. (E)
———, 'Rulers and Justice, 1200-1500', in P.A. Linehan and J.L. Nelson (eds), <u>The Medieval World</u>
    (London/New York, 2001), pp. 503-15. (E)
———, 'Freedom, law and the Medieval state', in Q. Skinner and B. Stråth (eds), <u>States and</u>
    <u>Citizens: History, Theory, Prospects</u> (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 51-62.
———, 'Political Thought' in D. Johnston (ed.), <u>The Cambridge Companion to Roman Law</u>,
    pp. 423-51 (2015) (E)
P. Stein, 'Roman Law', in CHMPT, pp. 37-47. (E)
B. Tierney, <u>Religion, Law and the Growth of Constitutional Thought</u>, 1150-1650 (1982), chs 1-3 (E)
* C. Woolf, <u>Bartolus of Sassoferrato: His Position in the History of Medieval Political Thought</u>
    (Cambridge, 1913) (E)

Further secondary reading:
J.P. Canning, 'Ideas of the state in the 13th and 14th century commentators on the Roman Law',
    TRHS, 5th series, 33 (1983), 1-27. (E)
———, <u>The Political Thought of Baldus de Ubaldis</u> (Cambridge, 1987; reissued 2002) (E)
———, <u>A History of Medieval Political Thought 350-1450</u> (1996), pp. 161-73. (E)
———, 'Italian juristic thought and the realities of power in the fourteenth century',
    in J.P. Canning and O.-G. Oexle (eds), <u>Political Thought and the Realities of Power</u>
    <u>in the Middle Ages</u>, ed. Canning and O.G. Oexle (Göttingen,1998), 228-39.
R.W. and A.J. Carlyle, <u>A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West</u>, vol. 6
    (repr. London / Edinburgh, 1970), pp. 293-324
H. Höpfl, 'Fundamental Law and the Constitution in Sixteenth-Century France', in R. Schnur (ed.),
    <u>Die Rolle der Juristen bei der Entstehung des modernen Staates</u> (Berlin 1986), 327-56
E.H. Kantorowicz, 'Kingship under the Impact of Scientific Jurisprudence', originally in M. Clagett,
    G. Post and R. Reynolds (eds), <u>Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern</u>
    <u>Society</u> (1961), pp. 89-111, reprinted in E.H. Kantorowicz, <u>Selected Studies</u> (1965), pp. 151-
    66
Daniel Lee, <u>Popular Sovereignty in Early Modern Constitutional Thought</u> (Oxford, 2016) (E)
P. Stein, <u>Roman Law in European History</u> (1999), esp. chs 3-4. (E)
W. Ullmann, 'De Bartoli sententia: Concilium repraesentat mentem populi', in Ullmann, <u>The Papacy</u>
    <u>and Political Ideas in the Middle Ages</u> (Aldershot, 1976)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Assess the importance of the corporation (*universitas*) in the political thought of the medieval Roman lawyers. (2020)

To whom did later medieval lawyers attribute the power to legislate, and on what grounds? (2019)

What role does the concept of the people play in the political thought of the medieval lawyers? (2018)

How did fourteenth-century Roman law jurists deploy the concept of the corporation in their analysis of political phenomena? (2017)

To whom did medieval experts in Roman law accord the power to legislate and why? (2016)

B15 RENAISSANCE HUMANISM AND POLITICAL THOUGHT

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Abbreviations:
CHRP: C.B. Schmitt et al., eds, The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy (1988) (E)
Kraye: J. Kraye, ed. Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts
        (2 vols; 1997), vol. II: Political Philosophy (E)

Suggested primary reading:

Leonardo Bruni, 'Panegyric to the City of Florence', in B.G. Kohl and R.G. Witt, eds, The Earthly
        Republic: Italian Humanists on Government and Society (Philadelphia, 1978), pp. 135-78
        [not available online in this edition; a partial translation is available in a resource from the
        University of York: https://www.york.ac.uk/teaching/history/pjpg/bruni.pdf]
Bartolomeo Sacchi (Il Platina), 'On the Prince' [1471], in Kraye, ch. 6 (E) or (M)
Bartolomeo Scala, 'Dialogue on Laws and Legal Judgements' [1483], in Kraye, ch. 12 (E)
Giovanni Pontano, 'On the Prince', in Kraye, ch. 5 (E)
Aurelio Lippo Brandolini, 'Republics and Kingdoms Compared' [*c*. 1491], ed. and tr. J. Hankins
        (I Tatti Renaissance Library, Harvard 2009) [not available online]
Niccolò Machiavelli, The Prince [1513], ed. Q. Skinner, trans. R. Price (Cambridge, 1988) (E)
Francesco Guicciardini, 'How the Popular Government Should be Reformed' [1512], in Kraye, ch.
        13 (E)
Niccolò Machiavelli, Discourses on Livy [*c*.1518], ed. J.C. and P. Bondanella (Oxford, 2003) (E)
        or ed. B. Crick (Penguin, 1970)
Desiderius Erasmus, The Education of a Christian Prince [1516], ed. L. Jardine (Cambridge, 1997)
        (E)
Thomas More, Utopia [1516], eds G. M. Logan and R. M. Adams (Cambridge, 1989) [see A5 More]

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
J.M. Blythe, '"Civic humanism" and medieval political thought', in J. Hankins, ed., Renaissance
        Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and reflections (2000), pp. 30-74 (E)
A. Grafton, 'Humanism and political theory', in The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-
        1700, ed. J. H. Burns and M. Goldie (1991), pp. 9-29 , (E)
*J. Hankins, 'Rhetoric, history and ideology: the civic panegyrics of Leonardo Bruni', in Hankins,
        ed., Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections (2000), pp. 143-78 (E)
        , 'Exclusivist republicanism and the non-monarchical republic', Political Theory 20 (2010)
        (E)
*P. Kristeller, 'Humanism', in CHRP, ch. 5 (E)
*N. Rubinstein, 'Political theories in the Renaissance', in A. Chastel et al. eds, The Renaissance:
        Essays in Interpretation (1982), pp. 153-200 (M)
*Q. Skinner, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought (2 vols; 1978), vol. I: The Renaissance
        (E)
R. Tuck, 'Humanism and political thought', in A. Goodman and A. MacKay, eds, The Impact of
        Humanism on Western Europe (1990), pp. 43-65 (E)
M. Viroli, From Politics to Reason of State (1992) (E)

Further secondary reading:

H. Baron, The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance (2nd edn, 1966), esp. the 'Epilogue' (E)

P. Godman, From Poliziano to Machiavelli: Florentine Humanism in the High Renaissance (1998)

J. Hankins, 'The "Baron thesis" after forty years and some recent studies of Leonardo Bruni',
        Journal of the History of Ideas, 56 (1995), 309-38 (E)

J. Kraye, 'Moral Philosophy', in CHRP, ch. 11 (E)

J. McConica, Erasmus (1991)

E. Nelson, 'The problem of the prince', in J. Hankins ed., The Cambridge companion
        to renaissance philosophy (Cambridge 2007) (E)

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

J.E. Seigel, Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism (1968) (E)

Q. Skinner, 'Political philosophy', in CHRP, ch. 12, (E), rev. as 'Republican virtues in an age of
        princes' in Skinner, Visions of Politics, vol. II, Renaissance Virtues (Cambridge, 2002), ch. 5
        (E)

———, Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes (1996), ch. 2 (E)

R.G. Witt, 'In the Footsteps of the Ancients': The origins of humanism from Lovato to Bruni
        (2000), esp. ch. 11 (E)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How widely were the political ideals of the Florentine republic shared by humanist writers on politics? (2020)

How far did Renaissance humanists agree that liberty was the highest political good? (2019)

Do the disagreements between humanists over the relative advantages of princely and republican governments reveal any fundamental differences of principle? (2018)

How important was history to Renaissance humanist political thought? (2018)

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

B16 OBEDIENCE AND RESISTANCE IN REFORMATION POLITICAL THOUGHT

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Suggested primary reading:

Luther and Calvin, On Secular Authority, ed. H. Höpfl (Cambridge, 1991) [not available online from UL.
Alt. trans. of Luther, On Secular Authority available at http://ollc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Secular-Authority-To-What-Extent-It-Should-Be-Obeyed.pdf .
Alt. Trans. of Calvin, On Civil Government, trans, by J. Allen, (i.e. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. IV, ch. XX) available at
https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.1058/page/n775/mode/2up .

John Knox, On Rebellion, ed. R. Mason (Cambridge, 1994) (E)

George Buchanan, A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots
 [written c. 1569, printed 1579], trans. R. Mason and M.S. Smith (Aldershot, 2004)
 [not 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]

Theodore Beza, The Right of Magistrates [1574], in J.H. Franklin, ed., Constitutionalism
 and Resistance in the Sixteenth Century (New York, 1969), pp. 101-35
[not available online through the UL; see alternatively,
https://www.constitution.org/cmt/beza/magistrates.htm]

Anon., Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos [1579], trans. G. Garnett (Cambridge, 1994) (E)

Secondary reading:

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

Suggested secondary reading:
R.R. Benert, 'Lutheran resistance theory and the imperial constitution', Il Pensiero Politico, 6
 (1973), 17-36
*R.E. Giesey, 'The Monarchomach triumvirs: Hotman, Beza and Mornay', Bibliothèque
 d'humanisme et renaissance, 32 (1970) (E)
H. Höpfl, The Christian Polity of John Calvin (1982), chs 7, 8 (E)
*R.M. Kingdon, 'Calvinism and resistance theory', in Burns and Goldie, ch. 7 (E)
P. Matheson, 'Humanism and reform movements', in A. Goodman and A. MacKay, eds,
 The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe (1990), ch. 2 (E)
A.E. McGrath, Reformation Thought: An Introduction (1988), chs 5, 8 (E)
F. Oakley, 'Christian obedience and authority', in Burns and Goldie, ch. 6 (E)
*J.H.M. Salmon, 'An alternative theory of popular resistance: Buchanan, Rossaeus and Locke',
 and 'Bodin and the Monarchomachs', both in Salmon, Renaissance and Revolt (1987) (E)

*Q. Skinner, <u>Foundations of Modern Political Thought</u> (2 vols; 1978), vol II: <u>The Age of</u>
<u>Reformation</u> (E)

Further secondary reading:
W. Balke, <u>Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals</u> (1981), chs 2, 10
J. H. Burns, 'The political thought of George Buchanan', <u>Scottish Historical Review</u>, 30 (1951), 60-8
(E)
W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, <u>The Political Thought of Martin Luther</u> (1984)
F.E. Cranz, <u>An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought</u> (1959)
R. von Friedeburg, <u>Self-Defence and Religious Strife in Early Modern Europe: England and</u>
<u>Germany, 1530-1680</u> (2002)
M. van Gelderen, <u>The Political Thought of the Dutch Revolt, 1555-1590</u> (1993) (E)
*_____, 'So meerly humane': theories of resistance in early modern Europe', in A Brett and J.
Tully eds., <u>Rethinking the foundations of modern political thought</u> (Cambridge 2006) (E)
D.R. Kelley, <u>Francois Hotman: A Revolutionary's Ordeal</u> (1973) (E)
R.M. Kingdon, 'John Calvin's contribution to representative government', in P. Mack and M.C.
Jacob, eds, <u>Politics and Culture in Early Modern Europe</u> (1987), pp. 183-98 (E)
S. Kusukawa, <u>The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melanchthon</u> (1995),
ch. 5 (E)
I.D. McFarlane, <u>Buchanan</u> (1981), ch. 11, pt 2
G. Oestreich, 'The religious covenant and the social contract', in Oestreich, <u>Neostoicism</u>
<u>and the Early Modern State</u> (1982) (E)
———, 'The origins of the Calvinist theory of revolution', in B. Malament, ed., <u>After the</u>
<u>Reformation</u> (1980); rev. in Skinner, <u>Visions of Politics</u> (3 vols; 2002), vol. II, ch. 9 (E)
J. Witte, <u>Law and Protestantism: The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation</u> (2002), ch. 4
(E)
_____, <u>The Reformation of Rights</u> (2007) (E)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Why was the history of magistrates insufficient on its own to support the contentions of Calvinist resistance theorists? (2020)

Assess the importance of natural principles in Calvinist resistance theory. (2019)

Account for the prominence of junior magistrates in Calvinist political theory. (2018)

What agency did Lutheran and Calvinist resistance theories give to the collective people? (2017)

Assess the importance and effectiveness of historical argument in Calvinist resistance tracts. (2016)

B17 REASON OF STATE

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*   (M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Suggested primary reading:

Justus Lipsius, <u>Politica</u> [1589], trans. J. Waszink (Amsterdam, 2004) or as <u>Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine</u>, trans. W. Jones [1594; on EEBO (E)] (facs. repr. 1970)

Giovanni Botero, <u>The Reason of State</u> [1591], trans. P.J. and D.P. Waley (1956), including 'The Greatness of Cities', trans. R. Peterson [1606], pp. 227-80 [not available in this edition, but see ed. by R. Bireley (2017) (E)

Michel de Montaigne, 'Of the Useful and the Honourable', 'Of the Disadvantages of Greatness', 'Of Evil Means Employed to a Good End', 'Of Glory', in <u>Essays</u>, trans. M.A. Screech (1991) [not available online in this edition, but see *Essays*, 4 vols, trans. by G. Ives, (1925) (E).
Francis Bacon, 'Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates', 'Of Empire', 'Of Simulation and Dissimulation', 'Of Seditions and Troubles' in <u>Essays</u> (numerous editions) [e.g. ed., by M. Kiernen (2000) (E)]
Henri, duc de Rohan, <u>Treatise of the Interests of the Princes and States of Christendom</u>, trans. H. Hunt (1640) [on EEBO (E)]
Armand du Plessis, duc de Richelieu, <u>The Political Testament of Cardinal Richelieu</u>, trans. H.B. Hill (1964) [not available online, but see <u>The Political Will and Testament of the Minister of State Cardinal Duke de Richelieu</u> (1695) [on EEBO (E)]].

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
J. Bartelson, 'Making exceptions: some remarks on the concept of <u>Coup d'État</u> and its history', <u>Political Theory</u>, 25 (1997), 323-46 (E)
*H. E. Braun: 'Knowledge and counsel in Giovanni Botero's '*ragion di stato*', *Journal of Jesuit Studies*, 4, 2 (2017) (E)
*P. Burke, 'Tacitism, scepticism and reason of state', in J.H. Burns with M. Goldie, eds, <u>The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700</u> (1991), pp. 479-98 (E)
H. Höpfl, 'Orthodoxy and Reason of State', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 23 (2002), 211-37 (E)
*N. Keohane, <u>Philosophy and the State in France: Renaissance to Enlightenment</u> (1980), chs 4-5 (E)
*N. Malcolm, <u>Reason of State, propaganda and the Thirty Years War</u> (Oxford, 2007) (E)
*N. Millstone, 'Seeing like a statesman in early Stuart England', 223, 1, *Past and Present*, 2014 (E)
M. Morford: Chapter 7, 'Tacitean Prudentia and the Doctrines of Justus Lipsius', in *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition* (1993) (E)
M. Peltonen, <u>Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640</u> (1995), chs 3-4 (E)
*J.H.M. Salmon, 'Rohan and reason of state', in <u>Renaissance and Revolt</u> (1987) (E)
*J.H.M. Salmon, 'Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', in L.L. Peck, ed., <u>The Mental World of the Jacobean Court</u> (1991) (M)
Q. Skinner, <u>The Foundations of Modern Political Thought</u> (2 vols; 1978), vol. I, ch. 9; vol. II, ch. 8 (E)
R. Tuck, <u>Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651</u> (1993), chs 2-4 (E)
*M. Viroli, <u>From Politics to Reason of State</u> (1992), chs 4-6 (E)

Further secondary reading:

G. Baldwin, 'Reason of state and English parliaments, 1610-42', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 25 (2004), pp. 620-41 (E)

R. Bireley, <u>The Counter-Reformation Prince: Anti-Machiavellism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe</u> (1990)

R. Boesche, 'The politics of pretence: Tacitus and the political theory of despotism', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 8 (1987), 189-210 (E)

W.F. Church, <u>Richelieu and Reason of State</u> (1973) (E)

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

H. Dreitzel, 'Reason of state and the crisis of political Aristotelianism: an essay on the development of 17th century political philosophy', <u>History of European Ideas</u>, 28 (2002), 163-87 (E)

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

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

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

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

N. Rubinstein, 'The history of the word <u>politicus</u> in early-modern Europe', in A. Pagden, ed., <u>The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe</u> (1987) (E)

K.C. Schellhase, <u>Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought</u> (1976), chs 5-7

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What was the 'reason' in 'reason of state'? (2020)

How did reason of state theorists reconfigure the relationship between prudence and virtue? (2019)

How was the thinking of reason of state theorists influenced by their understanding of the purposes of the state? (2018)

What place was there for virtue in 'reason of state'? (2017)

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

B18 SOVEREIGNTY

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Suggested primary reading

Jean Bodin, Bodin on Sovereignty: Four Chapters from the Six Books of the Commonwealth
    [1579], trans. J.H. Franklin (Cambridge, 1992) (E)
James VI and I, The Trew Law of Free Monarchies, in Political Writings, ed. J.P. Sommerville
    (Cambridge, 1994) (E)
John Cowell, The Interpreter (London, 1610), s.v. 'King (Rex)' [on EEBO (E)]
Francisco Suárez, On Laws and God the Law-giver,Bk III , Chh. 1-4, in Francisco Suárez.
    Selections from Three Works (Oxford 1944) , vol. II (translation); reprint of vol II, ed. by T.
    Pink, (Indianapolis, 2015), available online https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/selections-from-
    three-works ,
Sir Robert Filmer, Patriarcha, in Patriarcha and Other Political Works, ed. J.P. Sommerville
    (Cambridge, 1991) (E)
Hugo Grotius, The rights of war and peace, trans. F.W. Kelsey (3 vols; Oxford, 1913)
        or ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis 2005), Bk I chh. 3-4, available online:
        https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/grotius-the-rights-of-war-and-peace-2005-ed-3-vols .
Thomas Hobbes, On the citizen, ed. R. Tuck and M. Silverthorne (Cambridge 1998), ch. 6 (M);
    Leviathan, ed. R. Tuck (Cambridge 1996), chh. 16-18 [see A7 Hobbes for details on N.
    Malcom edition, available online]

Secondary reading:

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

Suggested secondary reading:
D. Baumgold, Contract theory in historical context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke (2010),
        ch. 2 and 4 (E)
A.S. Brett, Changes of state (2011), Ch. 5 (E)
J. Daly, 'The idea of absolute monarchy in seventeenth-century England', Historical Journal, 21
        (1978), pp. 227-51 (E)
J.H. Franklin, 'Sovereignty and the mixed constitution: Bodin and his critics', in CHPT, ch. 10 (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)
Q. Skinner, 'A genealogy of the modern state', Proceedings of the British Academy 162 (2009),
        325-70.
J. P. Sommerville, 'James I and the divine right of kings: English politics and continental theory'
        in L. L. Peck (ed.), The mental world of the Jacobean court (1991)
_____ , Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context (1992), Ch. 4-5
R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1992), Ch. 5 (E)
_____ , The sleeping sovereign (Cambridge 2016) (E)

Further secondary reading:

G. Burgess, <u>Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution</u> (1996), Part I

L. Foisneau, 'Omnipotence, necessity and sovereignty', in P. Springborg ed.,
    <u>The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes's</u> *Leviathan* (2007) (E)

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

H. Höpfl, <u>Jesuit political thought</u> (2004), chh. 9. 10, 13, 14 (E)

J.H.M. Salmon, 'Bodin and the Monarchomachs', in Salmon, <u>Renaissance and Revolt</u> (1987), ch. 5
    (E)

J. P. Sommerville, 'From Suarez to Filmer', <u>Historical Journal</u>, 25 (1982), 525-40 (E)

———, 'Absolutism and royalism', in CHPT (E)

R. Tuck, 'Hobbes and democracy', and K. Hoekstra's reply, 'A lion in the house', both in A.S. Brett
    and J. Tully eds., <u>Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought</u> (2006) (E)

S. Tutino, <u>Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth</u> (Oxford, 2010) (E)

For further reading on Hobbes see under A7

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Why was Grotius so exceptional among early modern theorists of sovereignty in holding that sovereign power could be divided? (2020)

What space, if any, did early modern theories of sovereignty leave for political actors other than the sovereign? (2019)

How did early modern theorists of sovereignty seek to assure unity? (2018)

Why were early modern theorists of sovereignty so concerned to characterise as incoherent any notion of 'mixed' government? (2017)

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

B19 ORIGINS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Suggested primary reading

Francisco de Vitoria, Relections 'On dietary laws, or self-restraint'; 'On the American Indians';
'On the law of war', in A. Pagden and J. Lawrance eds., <u>Vitoria. Political Writings</u> (Cambridge
1991) (E)

Francisco Suárez, *On Laws and God the Law-giver*, Bk II ch. 17-20; Bk III ch. 2; *De Caritate*
Disputation XIII, 'On war', sections 1, 2, 4 and 5, in <u>Francisco Suárez.</u>
<u>Selections from Three Works </u>(Oxford 1944), vol. II (translation). N.B. this editions has been
reissued with a new introduction, ed. by T. Pink, (Indianapolis 2015); it is available online in
the *Online Library of Liberty*: https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/selections-from-three-works

Alberico Gentili, <u>De iure belli libri tres</u> (Oxford: Clarendon 1933), vol. II (translation),
Bk I chh. 1-6, 12-16 [not available online]

Hugo Grotius, <u>The rights of war and peace</u>, trans. F.W. Kelsey (3 vols; Oxford, 1913) or ed. R Tuck
(Indianapolis 2005), 'Preliminary Discourse'; Book I chh. 1-2, Bk II chh. 1, 14, 17, 20, 22-25;
Tuck edition is available online in the *Online Library of Liberty*:
https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/grotius-the-rights-of-war-and-peace-2005-ed-3-vols

Thomas Hobbes, <u>De cive</u>, ed. R. Tuck, trans. M. Silverthorne (Cambridge 1998), ch. 14, section 4
[not available online; the defective Cotton translation as edited by H. Warrender (1983) is
available (E)].

Secondary reading

Suggested secondary reading:
D. Armitage, 'Hobbes and the foundations of modern international thought,' in A.S. Brett
and J. Tully eds., <u>Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought</u> (2006) (E)

A. S. Brett, <u>Changes of state. Nature and the limits of the city in early modern natural law</u> (2011),
chh. 1, 3, 8 (E)

G. Cavallar, <u>The rights of strangers. Theories of international hospitality, the global community</u>
<u>and political justice since Vitoria</u> (2002), chh. 2 and 3

J.P. Doyle, 'Francisco Suárez on the law of nations', in Mark W Janis and Carolyn Evans eds.,
<u>Religion and international law</u> (1999)

*B. Kingsbury and B. Straumann eds., <u>The Roman foundations of the law of nations</u> (2010),
esp. ch. 7, 9, 15, 16 (E)

N. Malcolm, 'Hobbes's theory of international relations,' in id., <u>Aspects of Hobbes</u> (2002) (E)

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

      , 'Vitoria and Suarez on *ius gentium*, natural law, and custom,' in A Perreau-Saussine
and J. Murphy eds., <u>The nature of customary law</u> (2007) (E)

* R. Tuck, <u>The rights of war and peace</u> (1999), Introduction and chh. 1-3 (E)

Further secondary reading:
A. Anghie, <u>Imperialism, sovereignty and the making of international law</u> (2005), ch. 1 (E)

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

William Bain ed., <u>Medieval Foundations of International Relations</u> (Routledge, 2016) (E)

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

A.S. Brett, 'Scholastic political thought and the modern concept of the state', in A.S. Brett and J. Tully eds., Rethinking the foundations of modern political thought (2006) (E)

G. Cavallar, 'Vitoria, Grotius, Pufendorf, Wolff and Vattel: Accomplices of European colonialism and exploitation or true cosmopolitans?', Journal of the History of International law 10 (2008) (E)

I. Hunter, 'Global justice and regional metaphysics', in S. Dorsett and I. Hunter eds., Law and politics in British colonial thought (Palgrave 2010) (E)

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

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

*D. Lupher, Romans in a new world. Classical models in 16th-century Spanish America (2006)

A. Pagden, The fall of natural man. The American Indians and the origins of comparative Ethnology (1982)

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

Q. Skinner, The foundations of modern political thought (1978), Vol. II, ch. 5 (E)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Was the early modern law of nations anything more than a charter for European imperial expansion? (2020)

How important was the notion of pan-human society in the early modern law of nations? (2019)

How important was natural reason for early modern theorists of international law? (2018)

What resources could early modern jurists and theologians draw upon to construct a conception of law between nations? (2017)

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

B20. POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE BRITISH REVOLUTIONS

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under 'Library Resources')

Suggested primary reading:

The civil war (all sources on EEBO (E): no modern edition)
Henry Parker, <u>Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses</u> (1642)
Henry Parker, <u>Jus populi</u> (1644)
Samuel Rutherford, <u>Lex, rex: The Law and the Prince</u> (1644); questions I-IX, XXI-XXV, XXVIII-XXIX.

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

The Commonwealth
John Milton, <u>Political Writings</u>, ed. M. Dzelzainis (Cambridge, 1991), esp. 'The Tenure of Kings and
        Magistrates' [1649] (pp. 3-48) [unavailable online, but for 1649 edition of . 'The Tenure of
        Kings and Magistrates', see *EEBO* (E).
Marchamont Nedham, 'A Discourse of the Excellency of a Free-State', in Nedham, <u>The Case of the
        Commonwealth of England Stated</u> (1650), pt II, ch. 5, pp. 80-94. On *EEBO* (E); or ed. P.A.
        Knachel (Charlottesville, 1969); or ed. B. Worden (Indianapolis, 2011), or online:
        https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/nedham-excellencie-of-a-free-state .
Thomas Hobbes, Review and Conclusion to <u>Leviathan</u> [1651], ed. R. Tuck (Cambridge, 1996), pp.
483-491 (see A7 Hobbes for details on Malcolm edition, available online]
James Harrington, <u>The Commonwealth of Oceana</u>, ed. J.G.A. Pocock (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 1-147
        (E).

Secondary reading:

<u>Suggested secondary reading:</u>
* John Coffey, <u>Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The mind of Samuel Rutherford</u> (1997),
        ch. 6 (E).
* S. D. Glover, 'The Putney Debates: popular vs. elitist republicanism', <u>Past and Present</u>, 164 (1999),
        47-80 (E).
M. Goldie, 'The civil religion of James Harrington', in A. Pagden, ed., <u>Languages of Political Theory
        in Early Modern Europe</u> (1987) (E).
* Michael Mendle, <u>Henry Parker and the English Civil War</u> (1995). (E).
R.B. Seaberg, 'The Norman Conquest and the common law: the Levellers and the argument from
        continuity', <u>Historical Journal</u>, 24 (1981), 791-806 (E).
*Q. Skinner, <u>Liberty before Liberalism</u> (1998) (E).
*K. Thomas, 'The Levellers and the franchise', in G. Aylmer, ed., <u>The Interregnum</u> (1972) (M)
R. Tuck, <u>Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651</u> (1993), ch. 6
*D. Wootton, 'Leveller democracy and the Puritan revolution', in J. H. Burns with M. Goldie, ed.,
        <u>The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700</u> (1991) (E).
*B. Worden, 'English republicanism', in J.H. Burns with M. Goldie, ed., <u>The Cambridge History
        of Political Thought, 1450-1700</u> (1991) (E).
* ———, 'Milton and Marchamont Nedham', in Armitage, Himy and Skinner eds., <u>Milton and
        Republicanism</u> (1995). (E).

Further secondary reading:

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

J.C. Davis, 'The Levellers and Christianity', in B. Manning, ed., Politics, Religion
and the English Civil War (1973)

M. Dzelzainis, 'Milton's classical republicanism, in Armitage, Himy and Skinner eds., as above (E).

J. D. Ford, '*Lex, rex iusto posita*: Samuel Rutherford on the origins of government',
in R. A. Mason, ed., Scots and Britons (1994) (E).

R. Gleissner, 'The Levellers and natural law: the Putney Debates of 1647', Journal of British Studies,
20 (1980), 74-89 (E).

I. Hampsher-Monk, 'The political theory of the Levellers: Putney, property and Professor
MacPherson', Political Studies, 24 (1976), 397-422 (E).

C. Hill, 'The Norman yoke', in Hill, Puritanism and Revolution (1958) (E).

A. Hughes, 'Gender and politics in Leveller literature', in M. A. Kishlansky and S. D. Amussen, eds.,
Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England (1995)

* Michael Mendle,   'Parliamentary sovereignty: A very English absolutism', in N. Phillipson and Q.
Skinner, ed., Political discourse in early modern Britain (1993) (E).

———, 'The Ship Money case, The case of shipmony, and the development of Henry Parker's
parliamentary absolutism', Historical Journal, 32 (1989), 513-36 (E).

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

J. G. A. Pocock, The Machiavellian Moment (1975), esp. ch. 11. (E).

I. M. Smart, 'The political ideas of the Scottish Covenanters, 1638-88', History of Political Thought,
1 (1980), pp. 167-93 (E).

J. Scott, Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution (2004) (E).

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

In what ways did political writers of the British revolutions counter the royalist claim that kingly power came directly from God? (2020)

'No right of rebellion was articulated in the British Revolutions. Theorists of resistance held that rebellion was what tyrants were guilty of.' Discuss.

What space did English republican authors leave for monarchy? (2018)

Why were the English Parliamentarians so reluctant to accept that their case implied a right to depose tyrannical kings? (2017a)

Assess the relative roles in Leveller thought of natural law and common law ancient constitutionalism. (2017b)

'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)

B21 TOLERATION IN THE LATER SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

Suggested Primary Reading:

Benedict de Spinoza, Theological-Political Treatise [1670], trans. R.H.M. Elwes (Dover, 1951), esp.
      ch. XIX; or see Spinoza, *Collected Works*, ed. by E. Curley, vol. II (2016) (E)
William Penn, The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience [1670], in The Political Writings of William
      Penn, ed. A. R. Murphy (Liberty Fund, 2002); available online:
      https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/penn-the-political-writings-of-william-penn .
Samuel Parker, A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie, 3rd edn (London, 1671), esp. chs. 1, 3, 6.
      Full text on EEBO (E).
John Locke, A Letter Concerning Toleration [1685], trans. William Popple [1689], ed. J. H. Tully
      (Hackett, 1983) (E).
Samuel Pufendorf, Of the Nature and Qualification of Religion in Reference to Civil Society [1687],
      trans. J. Crull [1698], ed. S. Zurbuchen (Liberty Fund, 2002), esp. §§1-22, 44-54; available
      online: https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/pufendorf-of-the-nature-and-qualification-of-
      religion-in-reference-to-civil-society .
Pierre Bayle, A Philosophical Commentary on … Luke 14:23 [1686–88], trans. anon. [1708],
      ed. J. Kilcullen and C. Kukathas (Liberty Fund, 2005), esp. part II; available online:
      https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/bayle-a-philosophical-commentary-on-these-words-of-the-
      gospel .
Jonas Proast, The Argument of the Letter Concerning Toleration (1690), in The Reception of Locke's
      Politics, ed. M. Goldie, 6 vols (Pickering & Chatto, 1999), vol. V [not available online in this
      edition; but see EEBO for the 1690 edition (E).

Secondary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:
*J. Dunn, 'The claim to freedom of conscience: freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of
      worship?' in From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in
      England, ed. O.P. Grell, J.I. Israel and N. Tyacke (Oxford, 1991), pp. 171–94 (E); reprinted in J.
      Dunn, The History of Political Theory and other essays, (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 100-20 (E).
*M. Goldie, 'The theory of religious intolerance in Restoration England', in From Persecution to
      Toleration, ed. O.P. Grell, J.I. Israel and N. Tyacke (Oxford, 1991), pp. 331–68 (E).
———, 'John Locke, Jonas Proast, and religious toleration, 1688–1692', in The Church of England,
      c.1689–c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism, ed. J. Walsh, C. Haydon and S. Taylor
      (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 143–71 (E)
J. Israel, 'Spinoza, Locke and the Enlightenment battle for toleration', in Toleration in
      Enlightenment Europe, ed. O.P. Grell and R. Porter (Cambridge, 2000) (E).
*R. Popkin and M. Goldie, 'Scepticism, priestcraft, and toleration', in The Cambridge History of
      Eighteenth-Century Political Thought, ed. M. Goldie and R. Wokler (Cambridge, 2006), pp.
      79–109 (E).
J. B. Schneewind, 'Bayle, Locke, and the concept of toleration', in Philosophy, Religion, and the
      Question of Intolerance, ed. M.A. Razavi and D. Ambuel (Albany, 1997), pp. 3–15
R. Tuck, 'Scepticism and toleration in the seventeenth century', in Justifying Toleration, ed. S.
      Mendus (Cambridge, 1988) (E)
*———, 'Hobbes and Locke on toleration', in Thomas Hobbes and Political Theory, ed. M. G. Dietz
      (Lawrence, KS, 1990), pp. 153–71

J. Waldron, 'Locke: toleration and the rationality of persecution', in <u>Justifying Toleration</u>, ed. S. Mendus (Cambridge, 1988) (E)

<u>Further secondary reading:</u>
J. Israel, 'The intellectual debate about toleration in the Dutch Republic', in <u>The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch republic</u>, ed. J.I. Israel et al. (Leiden, 1997), pp. 3–36
S. Jenkinson, 'Two concepts of tolerance: why Bayle is not Locke', <u>Journal of Political Philosophy</u>, 4 (1996), 302–21 (E)
J. Kilcullen, <u>Sincerity and Truth: Essays on Arnauld, Bayle and Toleration</u> (Oxford, 1988) (E)
J. Marshall, <u>John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture</u> (Cambridge, 2006) (E)
G. Schochet, 'Samuel Parker, religious diversity, and the ideology of persecution', in <u>The Margins of Orthodoxy</u>, ed. R.D. Lund (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 119–48
R. Vernon, <u>The Career of Toleration: John Locke, Jonas Proast, and After</u> (Montreal, 1997)
M. Yardeni, 'French Calvinist political thought', in <u>International Calvinism, 1541–1715</u>, ed. M. Prestwich (Oxford, 1985), pp. 315–37
P. Zagorin, <u>How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West</u> (Princeton, 2003)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

'…An individual may declare and teach what he believes, without injury to the authority of his ruler, or to the public peace' [SPINOZA, *Theologico-Political Treatise*, ch. XI]. How widely was this view shared among later seventeenth-century writers on toleration? (2020)

'Separation of church and state' is an anachronistic concept to foist on late seventeenth-century theorists of toleration.' Discuss. (2019)

Why did early modern advocates of toleration set limits on it? (2018)

'Most tolerationists were more committed to the principle of the duty to communicate the truth than to the right to liberty of conscience.' Discuss. (2017)

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

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

(All Tripos questions from the last five years appear as suggested supervision questions.)

N.B. Between 2016-2019 the exam papers listed Machiavelli as question 5, and More as question 6. This will be corrected in future exam papers.

2019-20

Examiner: Miss 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: Dr Christopher Brooke

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

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

In general, there were no glaring problems. Last year's Examiner's Report, for example, chastised POL7 candidates for their "insufficiently close engagement with the relevant set texts" and for being "excessively dependent on the views of Bernard Williams concerning Plato, and of Quentin

Skinner concerning, especially, Machiavelli and More", but there was little sign of these difficulties this year. Very few essays indeed read like rehashed supervision essays or regurgitated lecture notes. Indeed, the wide range of different arguments that were attempted with respect to the various authors, texts, and topics strongly suggested that students were thinking for themselves, drawing productively on a broad range of reading and reflection—and this made the Examiners very happy to see.

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

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

2017-18

Examiner: Dr Christopher Brooke

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

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

toleration (3), early Christians (2), Aquinas (1), and *raison d'état* (1), with two of the mediaeval questions, on spiritual and temporal power and on Roman law, attracting no candidates.

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

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

2016-17

Examiner: Dr Christopher Brooke

Thirty-eight candidates sat the paper. Twelve received an overall First-class mark, there were twenty-one Upper Seconds, and five Lower Seconds. Of the Firsts, eight received a First-class mark from both markers. There was one Upper Second script which received a First-class mark from one marker, and there were five scripts where the two marks straddled the Upper-Lower Second-class boundary.

Only one question attracted no answers—on mediaeval Papalism. Other mediaeval topics attracted only small numbers: two on Aquinas, two on the early Christians, one on the mediaeval reception of classical thought, and one on Roman law in the Middle Ages. Also unpopular were resistance theory, early modern international law, and the English Civil War, which each attracted one answer. Roman political thought attracted two, and toleration three. But the other questions were more popular: Plato (12), Aristotle (6), Augustine (5), More (17), Machiavelli (13), Hobbes (9), Locke (5), critics of Athenian democracy (6), Renaissance humanism (7—fewer than usual), *raison d'état* (13—more popular than usual), and sovereignty (7).

Answers that directly engaged with the set texts were preferred to those which read more like distant textbook overviews. Answers that patiently explored and engaged with the question that had been asked were preferred to those that began by taking steps to wrestle the material onto more familiar terrain. Very few essays indeed read as if they were simply summarising lecture

material. Some of the questions were quite challenging, and candidates were quite challenged—which is a useful reminder that students will generally do well to prepare more rather than fewer topics when they revise, in order to maximise the chances of finding three questions they can comfortably answer. The markers were struck by the way in which, with one exception, candidates skirted around the issue of gender, and women were left out of the answers, despite the fact that some of the questions (not least that on Aristotle) afforded the opportunity to bring them into consideration. Some comments on some of the questions follow.

POL7 candidates typically like to run their discussions of Plato's *Republic* through the lens provided by Bernard Williams' argument about the city-soul analogy, and the challenge posed by this question was that it made it quite hard for them to do that. Stronger essays raised the question of what 'the construction of philosophy' might be about early on, and stayed with the theme, rather than being diverted into more familiar pastures. Good answers on Aristotle got to the problem of division straightaway, rather than spending too long building up to it, and made sure to discuss questions of stability as well as questions of justice. Augustine answers were stronger to the extent that candidates wrestled with parts of the text of *The City of God* rather than offering more detached summaries of his theology or of what they took to be his political thought. The Machiavelli essays deployed a useful variety of examples from Agathocles and Pope Julius II to the republics of Venice and Rome, though some answers could have been a bit clearer about whether they were more in the business of defending or criticising Quentin Skinner's interpretations. The strongest essays on More showed good knowledge of the text of Books I and II of *Utopia*, were able to think about them side by side, and showed awareness of some of the problems surrounding the overall interpretation of the book's argument. Answers on Hobbes frequently needed to be more sharply concentrated on the precise question that the Examiners had asked, rather than simply offering a general account of what Hobbes has to say about liberty in *Leviathan*. Locke essays sometimes spent too much time outlining his critique of executive power, when the question was explicitly asking about what he had to say on its behalf.

In Section B, the essays on anti-democratic political thought in Athens pursued a variety of argumentative strategies, most of which worked quite well. The answers on humanism sometimes struggled to move beyond the deployment of historical examples in Renaissance texts to reflect on how history was being used more broadly. The question on reason of state was a popular one, with stronger answers working in themes from Catholic political thought, or Montaigne, or Foucault, in addition to the familiar faces of Lipsius and Botero. The essays on sovereignty needed to stick closer to the 'why' question that had been asked, rather than explain either how they thought mixed government was incoherent, or why they sought to fashion accounts of indivisible sovereignty.

All in all, those who marked POL7 were impressed. This was not an easy paper, the general standard of the answers was commendably high—and they were all pleasingly legible—and the best scripts were really excellent indeed.

2015-16

Examiner: Miss Sylvana Tomaselli

42 candidates sat this paper. In Section A, the most popular question this year was on Plato (with 23 answers), followed by that on Machiavelli (17), More (15), Aristotle (10), Hobbes (10), Locke (4) and Augustine (1), with no answers on Aquinas. In Section B, the most popular question was on Renaissance humanism (14), followed by that on the debates in ancient Athens on the difference

between democrats and anti-democrats (9), theorists of sovereignty (6), early modern international law (5), Roman political thought (4), Calvinist resistance theory (4), toleration (3), the English Civil War (2), reason of state (1), and papal and secular power (1), with no attempts at the questions on the early Christians, medieval citizenship, or Roman law. Several of the candidates chose to answer two questions in that Section.

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.

Those who had read the set texts with attention to detail, showed awareness of the conceptual issues and the issues within the scholarship, and engaged with these issues and the manner in which the authors dealt with them, as ever, did best. 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. *Leviathan*), or who did not explore the full implications of the questions, rehashing their weekly essays or regurgitating their lecture notes, did least well.

As has been said many a time in examiners reports, what is needed is clear evidence of textual knowledge, showing a concern with the key concepts behind the question, but allied to an argument about how the evidence relates to the question. This requires knowledge of the texts 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 knowledge of the intellectual and historical contexts in which the authors under consideration wrote, and that knowledge needs to be woven into the answer where appropriate, as opposed to mechanically repeated regardless of the question or the answer given to it.

Overall, the answers to the bulk of the questions were nevertheless solid, and some were very impressive indeed.