

Sovereignty in English Political Thought 1576-1628

Tod Moore

Submitted for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, Politics Department, Faculty of Arts,
University of New England, Armidale.

November 30, 1995

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification.

I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the author.

.....
Tod W. Moore

Preface

Because this work deals with the words of English writers and translators of four centuries ago (or more) it has been necessary to adopt a policy in relation to spelling. It has been decided to modernise spelling in a conservative fashion; that is, to use modern spellings where there can be no doubt about the word intended - e.g. "booke" to "book". Titles have been retained with original spelling. In all cases, modern usage has been adopted for certain forms of typography: "u" and "v", "vv", the long "s", "ff", and "i". Hopefully this style steers a middle course between the unreadable and the over-modified.

Unfortunately, it was too late to include in the main discussion of the thesis two important Bodin articles published in the Winter 1996 issue of *History of Political Thought*: Dan Engster, "Jean Bodin, Scepticism and Absolute Sovereignty", and, J. H. M. Salmon, "The Legacy of Jean Bodin: Absolutism, Populism or Constitutionalism?". Salmon's account of the English reception acknowledges the importance of the early period, although he stresses the Civil War writers, and the paper contains nothing which contradicts my main points. The Engster paper, which is very interesting, confirms the originality of Bodin's theory of sovereignty, notwithstanding the precedents in medieval public law. Engster notes the importance of the deist and constitutionalist elements in Bodin's writings, and advocates the study of Bodin's use of attributes in the *Six Books*.

Table of Contents

Preface	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Introduction	1
Chapter I, Bodin's Theory of Sovereignty.	20
Chapter II, English Conceptions of the State Before Bodin.	51
Chapter III, The Reception.	81
Chapter IV, Richard Hooker.	105
Chapter V, James I and The Succession Controversy.	126
Chapter VI, Forset and Court Writers.	162
Chapter VII, Walter Raleigh and the Parliamentary Constitution.	197
Conclusion.	230
Bibliography.	238

Acknowledgements

Research is commonly a solitary activity, but the ideas which guide and enlighten research are almost always generated or at least refined in conversation with others. During the time of this thesis there have been many conversations and other contacts which have assisted in delineating the problems and suggesting directions. Colleagues here in Armidale have given freely of their time, and also participated in lively discussions at seminars I have given on Emblems, La Primaudaye, Hooker and Raleigh. Some who are no longer here include John Warhurst, Pat Bishop, Stephanie Lawson, Steve Lovell-Jones, and Edward Reid-Smith. Still in Armidale, my thanks extends to David Wells, Jeff Archer, Graham Young, Tony Lynch, Tim Battin, Bligh Grant, Ray Bale, Ros Patterson, Neil Marshall and Edward Bridle. The first two seminars on the list were also given to Australasian Political Studies Association conferences, and helpful discussions took place with Stephen Tanner, Lenore Coltheart and Paul Corcoran. A version of the Raleigh paper was presented at the New Zealand Political Studies Association conference in Wellington in 1995, and I am grateful to Andrew Sharp and John McCrystal for their suggestions. The Hooker paper eventually became a journal article, and I particularly wish to thank the anonymous reviewers of *History of Political Thought* for their constructive criticism of the draft version of the article which appeared in the Autumn 1993 Issue. The people named here are by no means the only ones who have suggested ideas, and I apologise in advance to those whose names do not appear in the above list.

I would like to make special mention of library staff in general, and the staff at

the Dixson Library here in Armidale in particular. These people have been immeasurably helpful to me over the years, and none moreso than those charged with the difficult and often thankless task of supplying books, photocopies and microfilm reels from other libraries. Another group of people are the historians here who have patiently put up with the theorising of a political scientist, even when it falls well outside the pale of academic history writing. Three names from the History Department that deserve special mention are Janice Lord, Paul Hammer and Dan Byrnes. No longer with that Department, it was Heather Gregory who first sparked my interest in the renaissance, for which I shall always be grateful. Finally, I owe very much to my Supervisors. George Westbrook has been a strong support, especially in the earlier period of my candidature, and I have valued his sage advice and down to earth approach. Graham Maddox has been extremely helpful in the final years, but more than that, he has provided me with the tutelage that comes from working closely together on large projects. Through my work for Graham, first as a research assistant, and secondly as a research fellow, I have come to appreciate the depth of his scholarship and the breadth of his vision for the future of democratic political thought. My debt to him is both intellectual and spiritual.