The University of Chicago

Uses of Bodin Until the English Civil War

By

Jong Seo Lee

August 2025

A paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts degree in the
Master of Arts Program in the Social Sciences

Faculty Advisor: Adrian Johns
Preceptor: John Martin McCallum III

Abstract

This paper examines how Bodin was received in England until the English Civil War. While historians have paid much attention to the relationship between Bodin's theory of sovereignty and the English Civil War, other aspects of the reception of Bodin have less often been fully explored. However, contemporaries did not always read Bodin with the same focus as either modern historians or Bodin himself. Thus, this study of the early uses of Bodin attempts to pluralize the earlier reception of Bodin in seventeenth-century England. Bodin was read, used, and appropriated for diverse reasons, both within and outside politics. For instance, one less explored aspect of Bodin's works is how they were often engaged as sourcebooks of historical and political examples. While these examples could be used and appropriated without accepting his main ideas, they were not so clearly severed from their source. Among many examples, one most notable case is how contemporaries accepted, rejected, or reproduced his treatment of Protestant Geneva in the richly contested realm of religion. The survey of such uses of Bodin strongly suggests that, while many early modern English men of letters read Bodin's texts directly, many also learned about Bodin through others who mentioned Bodin. These indirect encounters with Bodin, moreover, reveal how contemporaries used authorities to refer to topics they were interested in, reflecting the intellectual culture and the religio-political milieu of the period. As a consequence, such appropriations of Bodin have inversely influenced Bodin's standing in the period as a modern authority. The traces of such secondary characterizations of Bodin are identifiable in the English Civil War period as well. It is questionable whether Bodin was "an icon of the moderate papist; and his political wisdom and moderation." How Bodin was represented and how this affected the fate of his arguments in the period merits further research.

Uses of Bodin Until the English Civil War

In the last few decades of the twentieth century, intellectual historians gradually shifted their focus from the influence of a thinker to the reception of a thinker. This transition was neither unilateral nor universally endorsed by historians. The theoretical and methodological origins behind this broader trend have also been multifarious, as skillfully outlined by Peter Burke.[1] Nonetheless, from the 1970s onwards, reception studies were increasingly visible.

A focus on reception offered some distinct advantages over a focus on influence. A focus on reception was more apt to assign and expect a more active role from the recipients of information and ideas. With a more searching eye, historians soon found out that these 'recipients' were doing many more things than merely reading and accepting. Historians became more alert to the various modes of reception (including rejection)—a development assisted by the richer and more diverse vocabulary that was available by viewing them as agents. To borrow some from Michael Baxandall's extended list of words: "draw on, resort to, avail oneself of, appropriate from, have recourse to, adapt, misunderstand, refer to…"[2]

In retrospect, it seems no coincidence that this new trend was accompanied by a number of other developments in intellectual history. One development was the growing tendency to question the centrality of canonical figures. The importance of a certain thinker was no longer presumed for non-canonical readers; rather, it was demonstrated through concrete studies of reception, through the diverse ways one's ideas were picked up and confronted. Another relevant development has been the increasing tendency to question the boundaries between subjects, such as those between political thought and other modes of thought. It became increasingly apparent that the recipients were not always of the same

---

[1] Peter Burke, "The History and Theory of Reception," in Howell A. Lloyd ed. *The Reception of Bodin* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

[2] Michael Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 58-9. From Ibid., 23.

intellectual disposition as the canonical thinkers. Of course, canonical texts in each subject were often read by readers who shared the authors' interests; however, they were also as often read by those with their own interests and intent.

These developments have also affected the scholarship of Jean Bodin, the sixteenth-century French Jurist. Traditionally, Bodin was taken predominantly, if not exclusively, as a political theorist. The success of his *Les Six Livres de la République* left a lasting influence on Bodin's reputation not only among contemporaries but also among later historians. The *République* outshone his other serious works, while his *De la Démonomanie des Sorciers* did not fare well with scholars who deemed it more a problematic text[3] than a part of Bodin's intellectual world. Even within the realm of political thought, however, there were few thinkers of the same importance as Bodin who were so representatively and superficially summarized by their single most important contribution: his theory of sovereignty.

As sovereignty became one of the cornerstones of modern political discourse, and Bodin the principal authority of it, some commentators observed that Bodin became a figure more often cited than actually read.[4][5] For historians, moreover, there was a further reason behind such disproportionate scholarly attention to sovereignty, beyond Bodin's own preoccupation with the concept. Bodin's theory was thought to be intertwined with, either as an instigator or a reflection of, the early modern process of "state-building" and "centralization"

---

[3] It remains a work that is not intuitively appealing to modern scholars, as demonstrated in the manner Quentin Skinner mentions it in his methodological essays. Of course, Skinner is well aware of and cites sympathetic studies of the text. Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*. Vol 1. *Regarding Method* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 28.

[4] Daniel Lee, *The Right of Sovereignty: Jean Bodin on the Sovereign State and the Law of Nations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 32.

[5] This tendency has been exacerbated by the absence of a modern translation of the text and has not been mitigated by the publication of Bodin's *République* in the Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought series. This version, prepared by J. H. Franklin, though valuable, is a greatly abridged version of the text. M. J. Tooley's version of *République*, though longer, is also far short of the full text. To Anglophone readers, Richard Knolles's 1606 translation is still the only full translation of Bodin available.

that was supposedly happening around the time of his writing. In other words, it was one of the focal points where political changes were thought to meet with changes in political thought. The polemical value of Bodin's emphasis on sovereignty was evident, and their relationship was summarized as such: Bodin's "doctrine of inalienable and indivisible sovereignty became a potent weapon in the hands of princes as they sought to define their position in relation to their own subjects and to other princes."[6] This reinforced the centrality, but sometimes the superficiality, of Bodin's argument.

It was through the works of many scholars that this picture of Bodin has become enriched and pluralized. We have become more aware of the fact that Bodin was not just a jurist or a political theorist, but many other things as well. For example, a natural philosopher, especially through the works of Ann Blair.[7] He was also a religious thinker, though he suppressed his most religious piece of dialogue perhaps because of its heterodox parts, leaving it unpublished until his death.

As a culmination of these earlier strands of scholarly initiatives including the general upsurge of interest in reception, a scholarly edited volume dedicated to "The Reception of Bodin" appeared in 2013. The volume covered diverse topics from Bodin's method and his own 'reception' of former knowledge to the reception of his works, such as the *Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem* and the *Démonomanie*.

Yet while the volume as a whole attempted to reorient its direction of approach from the title itself, the question of 'influence' was not entirely left out of sight. In particular, Glenn Burgess's chapter in the volume on Bodin in the English Revolution also questioned the point of focusing on reception instead of influence—whether we are missing something by not

---

[6] J. H. Elliott, *History in the Making* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 60-1.
[7] Ann Blair, *The Theater of Nature: Jean Bodin and Renaissance Science* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

paying attention to the influence of Bodin in the political thought behind the English Civil War. Considering that the English Civil War was a classic episode of early modern dispute over royal sovereignty and the rise of absolutist thought, it is not so surprising that Burgess retained this interest in Bodin's legacy. Indeed, there seems to be a gravitational pull of the centrality of sovereignty in Bodin studies.

Still, Burgess's treatment of the reception of Bodin in the English Civil War[8] begs the question: Is this lingering representation of Bodin as the theorist of absolute sovereignty the only way to organize our studies around him? Is 'reception' inevitably too intertwined with 'influence'? Is there value in reception studies in its own right?

This study has been driven by these directions of inquiry. I believe that these questions would be best answered by first taking reception seriously and also unselectively—how Bodin was received and used in early modern England.[9] This study of the early 'uses of Bodin' attempts to pluralize the earlier reception of Bodin in seventeenth-century England. Bodin was read, used, and *appropriated* for diverse reasons, including those that were remote from what historians today would expect—or what Bodin himself would have expected. Furthermore, some of these appropriations were reproduced by other users. This paper particularly focuses on how the users of Bodin and his works employed different strategies of citation to advance their own ends.

In the process, this paper further questions the relationship between 'reception' and 'appropriation', problematizing first some of the characterizations Burgess makes of the image

---

[8] There has been some dispute between historians over the naming of the conflict. This term is retained in this paper for lack of a better term to denote the conflict itself, avoiding the more confrontational connotations that accompany its alternatives, the 'English Revolution' or the 'England's Wars of Religion.'

[9] To make a survey of Bodin's reception in this fashion, this study has consulted and utilized the primary texts made available by Early English Books Online through Proquest (www.proquest.com/eebo), in connection with the extant secondary literature.

of Bodin. To what extent were early modern men of letters faithful recipients or appropriators of Bodin (or another precursor), removing bits of information from their original context? How separable is this 'appropriation' from 'influence,' or even 'reception'?

As a caveat, however, this paper extensively refers to Burgess's chapter not necessarily because I believe its approach to be fundamentally wrong, but to clarify how this study explores dimensions underexplored or not mentioned in his chapter while being inspired by his general outlook. Moreover, this study attempts to also go over one of the less-mentioned aspects of the volume as a whole which calls for more sustained attention: as the editor Howell Lloyd himself admitted at the closure of the book, "discussion of religious elements in the thought of this most religiously preoccupied of philosophers."[10] If this study is not fully revisionary of the extant scholarship on the early modern English reception of Bodin, it aspires to be at least complementary to it.

I

Glenn Burgess, in his chapter "Bodin in the English Revolution," starts by attempting to locate Thomas Hobbes's only reference to Bodin in his *Elements of Law* (Hobbes does not mention Bodin in his *De Cive* or the *Leviathan*). Composed around the time of the Short Parliament, the *Elements of Law* argued against the opinion that sovereignty could be divided, citing Bodin as the foremost authority. While Salmon's pioneering account of the reception of French political thought in England passed over Hobbes cursorily because Salmon thought Hobbes's "premises were quite different from Bodin's," Burgess questions, "If Hobbes owed so little to Bodin, what did he think he was doing when he cited him?"[11] In order to address this question, he contextualizes the uses of Bodin in the English Revolution.

---

[10] Howell A. Lloyd, "Conclusion," in Lloyd, *The Reception of Bodin*, 409.

[11] Glenn Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," in Lloyd, *The Reception of Bodin,* 387-8. From J. H. M. Salmon, *The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 114.

Burgess suggests four types of citations. The first type of use was *Example*, that is, writers cited Bodin to substantiate their historical or political examples of which Bodin's works were undoubtedly abundant. As a storehouse of examples, case studies, and exemplars, Burgess notes how Bodin's texts "could be mined for use without any overt engagement with Bodin's own ideas." Secondly, Bodin was cited as an *Authority*. He was, to both Protestants and Papists, "a man widely respected for his learning… a man whose opinion counted." At the same time, Bodin was an *Icon*. He came to represent a particular position, and citations of Bodin were as often intended to be used against those who were expected to find Bodin as a valuable authority and icon, for instance, papists and royalists. Lastly, Bodin's works were engaged as a *Creative Source*. Burgess explains that the label means uses of Bodin "that betoken a genuine intellectual engagement (appropriation or adaptation) of Bodin's ideas, to produce arguments that might not have been possible without Bodin's aid."[12]

In my purview, these are general typologies that do not preclude one specific citation from being included in another type. One could use Bodin's work as a sourcebook while evoking the authority or stance of Bodin at the same time. In this sense, then, Burgess's decision to "not explore the ways in which readers and writers employed Bodin's work… as sourcebooks of historical and political examples,"[13] is slightly difficult to understand. As the remainder of this paper aims to show, it is this decision that seems to have prevented Burgess from making possible connections and giving more specific answers to the interesting points that he raises in his chapter.

Nonetheless, Burgess documents a number of interesting ways Bodin was cited. For instance, Robert Filmer, when publishing the edited text of *The Necessity of the Absolute Power of All Kings* in 1648, attributed it to "Jean Bodin, a Protestant according to the Church of

---

[12] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 389-391.
[13] Ibid., 392.

Geneva."[14] Combining comments on Bodin from the 1640s to the 1660s, Burgess further suggested that "Bodin's authority and his role as icon were constructed from a few key ingredients… his authority as a learned man… his religion… as an icon of the moderate papist; and his political wisdom and moderation."[15]

The key focus of the chapter, then, falls to the polemical writings of the Civil War, whose authors wrote not only books but pamphlets of various qualities to forward their partisan causes. Both Royalists and Parliamentarians cited Bodin extensively, with unprecedented vigor. From the shared image of Bodin mentioned above, Burgess presumes the polemical value in claiming the support of Bodin. He notes that "much of the use was formulaic," falling into the categories established earlier. He concludes, "Thus far might reception theory, broadly conceived, take us: Bodin was used in the political writing of the English Revolution to address a fairly narrow range of topics, and was widely invoked as an authority and icon."[16] Then, Burgess questions whether we would miss something by not paying attention to influence, tradition, or the transmission of ideas, and ventures on to introduce representative cases from the Royalist and Parliamentarian writings of the English Civil War.

At the end of the chapter, Burgess returns to the question of explaining Hobbes's decision to quote Bodin in the *Elements of Law*. Burgess tries to suggest something beyond simple usage—something beyond a simple citation of Bodin's authority and examples. Thus, Burgess highlights that Hobbes's quotation of Bodin "was, in essence, to help him answer the question:" What constitutes a true commonwealth? Burgess concludes that the commonwealth laid out in *Leviathan* conformed to a Bodinian idea of a commonwealth in key respects because it also was predicated on Bodin's contention that sovereignty is "integral to the definition and

[14] Ibid., 392. Another version of *Necessity* left the authorship anonymous.
[15] Ibid., 393.
[16] Ibid., 395.

being of the commonwealth." Burgess then contrasts Hobbes with authors before the Civil War who were uninterested in the necessity for sovereign authority. In conclusion, Burgess notes that the political debate of the English Civil War was conducted in a post-Bodinian world, that is, a world that foremostly included "an idea of absolute sovereignty as part of its vocabulary."[17]

On a general level, I agree with Burgess that Hobbes's commonwealth in the *Leviathan* was a Bodinian one in a broad sense. At the same time, I am not sure if this broad and general characterization of either Bodin's influence or Bodin used as a *Creative Source* satisfies his original ambition to situate Hobbes's reference to Bodin in a historical context. If Hobbes was, as Burgess notes, "notoriously reluctant to acknowledge any debt to other authors,"[18] is it sufficient to end with this account of the general "influence" of Bodin which implies Hobbes's indebtedness to Bodin? What Hobbes seems to be doing is, as will be shown later in the paper, something very similar to what his contemporaries were doing. Hobbes appropriates Bodin's authority to reinforce his argument on a specific characteristic of sovereignty—but not so specific a characteristic, because it is related to the application of Bodinian sovereignty and the debate that preceded it in Germany.

Therefore, Burgess's 'contextualization' to situate Hobbes's quote in the grand conceptual shift that occurred after the 1640s, when Parliamentarians argued against monarchy as unsuited to the concept of the commonwealth, seems unsatisfactory for its own presented purpose. It seems to once again reduce our understanding of Bodin's contribution to the grand theory of sovereignty that defines a commonwealth. Again, I would like to shift the focus to the more specific, detailed aspects of Bodin's reception, not only on *sovereignty* but also in relation to his myriad of examples and specific points as well. Moreover, to understand Bodin's standing as a thinker in 1640, it will be necessary to understand the reputation of Bodin and the

---

[17] Ibid., 405-7.
[18] Ibid., 387.

discussion of his ideas that preceded Hobbes's citation, as much as it is necessary to appreciate the discussion that follows it.

II

To be sure, the typology that Burgess provides does capture some of the aspects of the diverse and variant ways Bodin was read and engaged with. On the other hand, his classification is also at risk of being too artificial because Bodin's general image, that is, either as an authoritative figure or an iconic representative of a position, was often invoked when his works were used as a sourcebook, for both examples and specific points of argument. Some examination of Bodin's texts as a sourcebook will thus be necessary for an understanding of the general 'image' of Bodin. Generally speaking, the reputation of Bodin remained consistent over the seventeenth century. However, it was also open to the manner in which contemporaries intended to employ specific examples or arguments from Bodin. While Bodin was used for diverse reasons, certain readings of Bodin were not entirely random or arbitrary.

To begin with, Bodin was renowned for his memory and learning, in the sense of erudition.[19] To many seventeenth-century English authors, Bodin appeared to be a reliable and credible source of information. Bodin was often cited in marginal notes without explicit justification or explanation. Sometimes his identity was obscured in the main text, but he was as often noted to be "well learned and experienced," especially when the author wanted to reinforce the point borrowed from Bodin.[20]

As Bodin's works themselves were flooded with adages and examples of the past, Bodin became the indirect source of learning and erudition to which he himself was a

[19] Blair, *The Theater of Nature*, 70. Yet it is not difficult to multiply the instances in which he is commended for his learning. For instance, George Hakewill writes in 1627, "Iohn Bodin a man of singular learning, specially in matter of History." George Hakewill, *An Apologie of the Power and Prouidence of God in the Gouernment of the World* (Oxford, 1627), 7.

[20] William Pemberton, *The Charge of God and the King to Iudges and Magistrates* (London, 1619), 44.

recipient.[21] For example, Robert Abbot borrowed a saying from Cato while citing Bodin's *République*.[22] Richard Bernard gathered the opinion of "Some Schoolmen…: Aquinas, Bonanen, Albertus, Durand" on seeking help from witches through the words of Bodin.[23] As more careful or erudite readers would have consulted or were aware of the original source of information (or more credulous ones could have omitted Bodin as the intermediary) these instances would have been more frequent than they appear in print, and Bodin seems to be one of the preferred intermediaries of learning.

When Bodin was quoted for specific bits of information and examples, moreover, it was often a result of a wider intellectual culture of commonplacing, a practice that was employed by many early modern men of letters including Bodin himself. Although it is difficult to ascertain the degree his works were approached in such a manner from printed citations of Bodin, yet there are certain traces of commonplacing. As Ann Blair has noted, the method of commonplaces is easiest to trace when an author cites a little-known fact from an unusual source: for instance, Bodin culls one event or detail from a huge volume, and uses it for his own, very different purpose.[24] Likewise, many early modern references of Bodin draw on him once in the whole work on one specific detail or example. These examples were also often taken out of their original context and employed for the purposes of their appropriators. Sometimes more than a few examples, thematically related, were extracted. Furthermore, some

---

[21] Blair, *The Theater of Nature*, 70-71. Blair even writes that both *Methodus* and *République* "suffer from an overabundance of commonplaces, heaped together with insufficient discipline," in accordance with the view of Anthony Grafton, "Editing Technical Neo-Latin Texts: Two cases and their Implications," in John Grant ed., *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York: AMS Press, 1989). On Bodin as a recipient of learning, see also *The Reception of Bodin*, Introduction and Ch. 4-5.

[22] Robert Abbot, *A Wedding Sermon Preached at Bentley in Darby-Shire* (London, 1608), 58. Next to his quote, "euen the very heathen man accounting it a point of sacriledge for a man to strike his wife," Abbot added in the margins, "Bodin de repub. lib. 1 cap. 3. ex Catone."

[23] Richard Bernard, *A Guide to Grand-Iury Men* (London, 1627), 144-5.

[24] Blair, *The Theater of Nature*, 73.

of these examples were repeated by the same authors in different publications almost identically—another aspect that strongly suggests the use of commonplaces by early modern English men of letters on Bodin's works.

The motives behind such activities of commonplacing were not uniform. Such usage of Bodin's works as sourcebooks included a wide array of themes and topics. This is unsurprising for Bodin's works, which attracted readers with various interests; the works themselves covered an equally wide range of things. Yet certain uses of Bodin do not appear to be wholly random or arbitrary. For instance, some very specific examples were repeated by different authors. This is surprising because all of Bodin's books that were widely cited, his *Methodus*, *République*, and *Démonomanie*, were so replete with factoids that it is unlikely that their readers would have been interested in the same examples without any prior awareness.

For some of these cases, it is easier to see why this happens for. They are replicated for clear religious and political motives, such as the topic of the ecclesiastical government of Geneva or Bodin's diagnosis of the form of European states. Yet the reason other examples are repeated is harder to tell, not least because they are examples pulled out from Bodin without much engagement with his ideas. For instance, at least three authors, Matthew Sutcliffe, Richard Mocket, and Samuel Garey, have quoted Bodin on the same incident of treason. Citing the fifth chapter of the second book of *République*, they all emphasized how grave the crime of treason is, relating to a gentleman of Normandy who was punished for confessing the sin of having the intention of murdering the king to a friar.[25] What triggered all three of these authors to cite a seemingly unimportant—compared to the decisions and judgments that Bodin makes

[25] Matthew Sutcliffe, *A Briefe Replie to a Certaine Odious and Slanderous Libel* (London, 1600), 99; id., *A Challenge Concerning the Romish Church* (London, 1602), 184; Richard Mocket, *God and the King* (Cambridge, 1615), 86; Samuel Garey, *Great Brittans Little Calendar* (London, 1618), 202.

in the same chapter[26]—incident? To put this differently, it has been mentioned that early modern men received knowledge and information through reading and citing Bodin: through whom did they read or learn about Bodin? Again, it is difficult to ascertain without each of these authors' working notebooks or annotated texts. Still, all four of these texts (Sutcliffe repeated this example in two of his books) shared the goal of arguing against Catholic, or more specifically Jesuit, approbations of regicide on the basis of religion. Thus, it will not be far off the mark to conjecture that these references were perhaps a result of indirect, secondary encounters with Bodin, through a process of reading earlier works on similar topics. The intermediaries of the example, be it Sutcliffe or another person, however, were not directly mentioned, and Bodin was the one worth being left in the printed text (or in the margins).

In terms of expertise, Bodin was most frequently and consistently mentioned as a great politician and a renowned statesman throughout the seventeenth century. Accordingly, the *République* and the *Methodus* were indeed quoted for many political and historical issues and examples in political and historical treatises. Yet he was also read and mentioned for his different works. Bodin's *Démonomanie* was oft-quoted by early modern readers who were eager to dispute the issues of witchcraft and demonology. Bodin was often grouped as an icon who believed in the real presence and activity of the devils, sorcerers, and witches; he was cited to provide reports of them or was confronted by those who were skeptical. Yet his standing in these occult topics does not seem to be as outstanding as his reputation as a *politique*.[27] Less

[26] The location of the example makes it difficult for those reading Bodin's *République* to be ignorant of Bodin's verdict on the English King to be an absolute monarch.

[27] The reputation of Bodin in terms of natural philosophy does not seem to have fared much better, though it is not easy to discern whether this derives from the lack of English interest in Bodin's *Theatrum* or Bodin's anti-Aristotelianism. See Blair, *The Theater of Nature*, 195. English reference to Bodin's natural philosophy seems to be sparse in the early seventeenth century. To provide an example from the French side, Scipion Dupleix rejects Bodin's view on snow's color, writing "Bodin very little to the purpose, as hee ordinarily miscounts." Scipion Dupleix, *The Resoluer; or Curiosities of Nature* (London, 1635), 295.

often cited was Bodin's more economically minded *Réponse de J. Bodin aux paradoxes de M. de Malestroit*. Still, his image as a "famous and learned Politician (The great French Politician.)"[28] is maintained among the users of this text.[29][30]

Hence, Bodin was a modern authority of some kind, especially in matters of political judgment, but also in many learned topics. Rarely was Bodin negatively portrayed in political matters. One exception was for his opposition to women's government, in which Bodin's argument was most consistently rejected and also once portrayed to be "as some vnwisely-ambitious, haue repiningly-murmured."[31] This would be explained by the different political circumstances in England, the ongoing or preceding reign of Elizabeth I.[32] As other historians have shown how the status of a modern authority has expectedly led to an acceptance of Bodin's views by his readers[33] or how he was co-opted in order to reinforce one's controversial opinions,[34] I would like to briefly go over the cases in which Bodin was sometimes cited as a man of good judgment, only to be disagreed with on some specific matters.

---

[28] Gerard Malynes, *Consuetudo, Vel Lex Mercatoria* (London, 1622), 479.

[29] Edward Misselden, *The Circle of Commerce* (London, 1623), 45. Edward Misselden criticized Gerard Malynes for his use of multiple languages while commending the same practice of Bodin and Hugo Grotius.

[30] It should be noted, of course, that this was before 'economy' was established as a distinct discipline, and the sixth book of the *République* also contained ideas from the *Réponse* such as inflation, because Bodin would have thought economic matters in the *Réponse* to be a part of political economy, or with a certain sensibility that approximates the intimacy of these fields.

[31] Willilam Crompton, *A Wedding-Ring, Fitted to the Finger of Euery Paire That Haue or Shall Meete in the Feare of God* (London, 1632), 11.

[32] The rejection of Bodin's opposition against women's government that lingers a few decades after Elizabeth I's death demonstrates how long specific ways of referencing an author could survive through some kind of unintended transmission, probably through commonplacing. This qualifies to some extent the findings of Sara Miglietti on the early reception of *Methodus*, when she writes, "once the reign of elizabeth was over and the gender–politics connection broken, the question of female rule would have lost much of its appeal." Sara Miglietti, "Reading From the Margins: Some Insights Into The Early Reception of Bodin's *Methodus*," in *Reception of Bodin*, 207.

[33] Blair, *The Theater of Nature*, 188.

[34] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 390.

For example, George Abbot mentions Bodin, softly critiquing Bodin's theory of numbers in history yet adding a positive assessment: "Herein Bodine in his Methode of Historie is too free, howsoeuer for other matters of inuention and good wit, scant thought of before his time, his industrie is praise-worthie."[35] Why would one commend another's good wit, as Abbot does of Bodin, when he is brought for a view only to be rejected?

There would have been more than one single reason, but without a doubt, this was part of an erudite culture. Early modern men of letters were keen to prove their learning, and they hoped to be able to or felt the need to demonstrate their knowledge or awareness by multiplying the number of relevant authorities. Furthermore, they could showcase their judgment by criticizing important intellectuals—a tendency not limited to early modern men of letters. Thus, it was some kind of an opportunity. Naturally, the status of modern authority meant that one became a focus of critical attention as much as holding 'influence' over those who were ready to accept one's views. In these cases, it was better that they were left important.

Two further similar references to Bodin are worth looking into in this regard. In 1602, William Fulbecke agreed with Bodin who "in my mind giueth good counsell to princes" to tax luxurious goods, but then added, "but vainely and contradictorily to himselfe doth Bodinus say, that" these should not be prohibited, nor can they be prohibited even if the prince wants to.[36] Fulbecke concluded, "as for *Bodinus* I excuse him thus: *Nullum fuit magnum ingenium sine mixtura dementiae,* which *Seneca* obserueth."[37] In the following year, Samuel Harsnett, in his chapter on the "strange formes, shapes, and apparitions of the deuills," mentioned two aphorisms. Firstly, "a melancholicke braine is the chaire of estate for the deuil." Secondly, and identically from the sayings of Seneca as in Fulbecke, "there is no great wit, without some

---

[35] George Abbot, *Exposition Vpon the Prophet Ionah* (London, 1600), 387.
[36] Fulbecke quotes in Latin, "*Haec principi prohibenda non sunt, nec si velit possit*."
[37] William Fulbecke, *The Second Part of the Parallele* (London, 1602), 70.

mixture of madnesse." According to Harsnett, then, Bodin was the 'perfect Idaea' for both: "who beeing in his younger yeeres of a most piercing, quicke, speculatiue wit, which grew of a light, stirring, and discursiue melancholie in him," finally believing "that deuils may transforme themselues into any shape of beasts, or similitude of men" and narrating ridiculous tales of their activities.[38] As such, Bodin was not always mentioned positively, but also in a blend of manners.

On the whole, then, individual citations of Bodin fashioned him in ways that befitted their purposes of using Bodin. Many were 'formulaic' in the sense that they resorted to Bodin without much critical reflection and sometimes through indirect, secondary encounters with Bodin. But this was not always the case, even when authors were preoccupied with one or two specific points from Bodin's work; by no means was Bodin read and cited for a narrow range of topics, once outside the political arena. Bodin was used to support certain points but was also directly confronted. Yet even when Bodin's specific ideas were confronted or criticized, it did not always mean that the status of a modern authority was under assailment.

Here, it remains to inquire into the more sustained representations of Bodin in the more confrontational domains of thought. Yet before delving into the citations that focus on the political aspects of Bodin, it is worth visiting his religious representation as part of the bigger religio-political world that his contemporaries inhabited.

III

Over the last forty years, studies of early modern England have poured forth exhortations for historians to take seriously the religious aspect of the English Civil War.[39] By the efforts of historians such as John Morrill, it has become increasingly difficult to separate

---

[38] Samuel Harsnett, *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* (London, 1603), 132-3.
[39] For instance, Glenn Burgess and Charles W. A. Prior eds. *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited* (Farnham: Routledge, 2011).

the 'political thought' of the English Civil War from religious beliefs and ideas of the period. Peter Lake has further justified this scholarly trend by demonstrating that debates about religion and church government were "one of the best places to look if we want to see contemporaries actually talking relatively systematically about how the polity should be structured and run."[40] To add to this, religion and church government were also one of the major ways in which contemporaries read and put various texts into use, even on texts that weren't properly 'theological' in any sense.

Bodin was no exception. In the realm of reception, Bodin's case also warrants a reconsideration of the boundary between political thought and religious ideas. Since the late sixteenth century, Bodin was consumed by readers who were very alert to religious language. In turn, his texts were appropriated with religious intent. Bodin was often mentioned or cited in printings of sermons and works of religious disputations as well.[41] In the process, the generally acknowledged authority of Bodin was intensely contested, and religious issues eventually, though perhaps somewhat inadvertently, left their impact on the authority of Bodin.

On a general level, as Bodin submitted to the established church of France and never officially abandoned Catholicism, English readers also recognized him as a Catholic—or as a 'papist,'[42] according to contemporaries' expressions. Although twentieth-century research of Bodin's religious views, especially concerning his unpublished text, the *Colloquium Heptaplomeres de Rerum Sublimium Arcanis Abditis*, has been keen to show how his religious

---

[40] Peter Lake, "Puritanism, (Monarchical) Republicanism, and Monarchy; or John Whitgift, Antipuritanism, and the "Invention" of Popularity," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40, No. 3 (2010), 463-4.

[41] A rather unsurprising fact, as the majority of the texts published in the period were related to or interested in religion.

[42] John Donne calls Bodin a "Catholique Author," yet it is not clear if he does so as a recusant Catholic or as a convert to Anglicanism. John Donne, *Pseudo-martyr* (London, 1610), 11. Donne's religion has been recently disputed in the article by Mary Morrissey, "Was John Donne a Catholic?: Conversion, Conformity, and Early Modern English Confessional Identities," *The Review of English Studies* 74 (2023): 64–77.

instincts tended to be heterodox or Judaistic in their nature, Bodin was not particularly notorious for his heterodoxy, at least until later in the seventeenth century and especially after Pierre Bayle.[43] Still, to many seventeenth-century English protestants, papist identity was never a positive one, as a "professed enemie in religion."[44] On one occasion Bodin was introduced as a Christian author, but only in contrast to the pagan writers of antiquity.[45] Bodin was more likely to be quoted at points where authors were referring to Catholics as a group.[46] At the same time, however, there was one further complexity—Bodin's works were enlisted in the Catholic Index of Forbidden Books. As a papist whose works were prohibited by papists themselves, Bodin's standing in religion and the value of his views were not so firmly settled at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

In this regard, Bodin's *Methodus* deserves more attention than has often been paid by historians.[47] It is telling that, from early on, one of the more highlighted passages of Bodin's

---

[43] There is a long history of attributing Judaism to Bodin's religion. Pierre Bayle, though Noel Malcolm qualifies it to be more of an item of scholarly gossip than a serious accusation, concluded that either Bodin had no religion or was a follower of Judaism. Vittor Ivo Comparato, "Readers of Bodin in Italy," in Lloyd, *The Reception of Bodin*, 363; Noel Malcolm, "Jean Bodin and the Authorship of the 'Colloquium Heptaplomeres.'" *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 69 (2006), 148-9. A classic account of Bodin's religion in modern historiography is Christopher R. Baxter, "Jean Bodin's Daemon and his Conversion to Judaism," in Denzer, Herausgegeben von Horst ed. *Jean Bodin: Proceedings of the International Conference on Bodin in Munich* (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1973), 1-22.

[44] George Hakewill, *An Answere to a Treatise Written by Dr. Carier* (London, 1616), 155-6. Of course, Hakewill was writing to appropriate Bodin's mention of Geneva against a Catholic writer. "your censure vpon Geneua and Caluin... Yet for Geneua may truly thus much bee said, euen out of the mouth of Bodin a professed enemie in religion, that neither drunkennesse, nor idlenesse, nor professed Beggerie, nor open wantonnesse were to be found in that Citie."

[45] Lancelot Dawes, *Gods Mercies and Ierusalems Miseries* (London, 1609). Dawes is, however, slightly critical of Bodin in this mention: "I little maruell that heathen Philosophers should shoote so wide, when Christians haue so grossely mistaken their marke. Bodin how wittie is hee in pleading for numbers?"

[46] For instance, Thomas Adams puts Bodin in the margin next to the passage where he refers to Catholics as a whole with the pronoun "they." Thomas Adams, *A Commentary or, Exposition Vpon the Diuine Second Epistle Generall* (London, 1633), 882.

[47] Sara Miglietti's research into the marginal annotations left by the readers of Bodin's *Methodus* introduces some cases where readers have been preoccupied with religious or

Methodus was the one on the state of Geneva, in the sixth and longest chapter, where his earlier theory of sovereignty is laid out. In 1591, Henry Barrow seized the opportunity to argue for the merits of presbyterian church government: "Bodin… at length descendeth to the state of Geneua, & giueth a very honourable testimony of the great profit arising by the Discipline and Eldershippe to that common wealth." Quoting an entire paragraph from Bodin's illustration of Geneva as a well-disciplined city by its elders, Barrow concluded, "The more popishe and corrupt that this Bodin is, the more auaileable and lesse partiall is his testimony in this matter."[48] The essence of Barrow's argument and his way of claiming credibility and impartiality from the 'popishe' character of Bodin are unmistakable.

Matthew Sutcliffe responded vehemently in the following year: "Much lesse is there reason we should beleeue… *Bodin* a man better conuersant in pollicy, then in diuinity, and whose religion was al poperie."[49] Sutcliffe's strategy was twofold. On the one hand, he distinguished 'policy' from 'divinity,' and did not acknowledge Bodin's authority in divinity. On the other hand, he also inverted Barrow's claim on the 'popish' nature of Bodin's religion. These two strategies were sequentially presented in a single sentence, and they demonstrate how a distinction between political and divine matters was never absolute and did not preclude an interest in the religion of the author. On the contrary, they worked hand in hand.

Sutcliffe continued further to problematize the content of Barrow's claims: "yet if we should, I do not finde any thing in eyther that soundeth to the honor of the Aldermens cause… For the wordes alleadged out of *Bodin* his methode of histories concerne the Aldermen nothing; *He speaketh of the censure of Bishops.* and did neuer imagine, nor could conceiue, that the censures of the Church were put in the hands of prophane men… But what if *Bodin* should say

---

theological issues, but not how they were in turn represented in print. Miglietti, "Reading From the Margins," 205.

[48] Henry Barrow, *A Petition Directed to Her Most Excellent Maiestie* (London, 1591), 12-3.

[49] Matthew Sutcliffe, *An Ansvvere to a Certaine Libel Supplicatorie* (London, 1592), 42-3.

somewhat of matters he vnderstoode not, his authoritie is very weake in this case, being neither good in diuinitie, nor excellent in pollicie, and neither vnderstanding the state of *Geneua,* nor our countrie."[50] In comparison with his opening statements on Bodin, Sutcliffe concluded by mentioning divinity first, subtly devaluing Bodin's authority in policy as well. As such, Sutcliffe attempted to contain the value of Bodin's authority in matters outside his expertise—and as a person ignorant of the state of England.

In retrospect, Sutcliffe's response was far short of quelling this particular way of quoting Bodin, which exalted the merits of presbyterian church government. This very specific and 'presbyterian' appropriation of Bodin not only survived during and after the Civil War, but it also spilled into the general image of Bodin, when his works, chiefly the *République*, were finally taken and put into serious polemical use.

It is difficult to definitively track how the disproportionate interest in this specific paragraph from Bodin's monograph was transmitted throughout the seventeenth century. Against what one might expect, Sara Miglietti's preliminary research on early modern annotations by the readers of the *Methodus* has highlighted how almost every copy of English provenance left this 'political' chapter (wherein the paragraph originates) largely untouched.[51] Thus, in this example of Geneva as well, users of Bodin would have more likely encountered Bodin through the writing of an intermediary. Through such a process, the passage would have been able to catch the attention of many, including readers of Bodin from both sides of the debate, presbyterians and episcopalians. In 1611, Thomas Brightman referred to "that famous testimony of Iohn Bodin, speking of them of Geneva."[52] Indeed, this specific way of employing Bodin was not confined to small circles of 'puritans' or 'presbyterians.' This

---

[50] Ibid., 42-3. As Sutcliffe pointed out, the original wording in Bodin's Latin in the *Methodus* was *censura pontificum*.
[51] Miglietti, "Reading From the Margins," 208.
[52] Thomas Brightman, *A Revelation of the Apocalyps* (Amsterdam, 1611), 91.

example could be appropriated by other groups of individuals for different circumstances. Writing against Catholics, George Abbot, the future archbishop of Canterbury, also employed Bodin in much the same way in 1604.[53] Thus, similar uses of Bodin were intermittently visible throughout the early seventeenth century, though not for the exact same goals. John Milton also made a similar argument for presbyterian church government in the early years of the English Civil War,[54] and more were to appear in the middle of the Civil War years.[55]

It is this specific context that seems to have fueled Robert Filmer to attribute one version of his *The Necessity of the Absolute Power of All Kings* to "John Bodin, a Protestant according to the Church of Geneva."[56] Publishing a text wholly consisting of extracts from Bodin's *République* to support absolute monarchy, Filmer seems to have intended to either capitalize on Bodin's reputation among puritans or satirize how parts of his texts could be pulled out for partisan arguments. Perhaps, he aimed at both. It was not solely the result of a general, vague association of the Parliamentarians with Calvinist ideas that Bodin was

---

[53] George Abbot, *The Reasons Which Doctour Hill Hath Brought, for the Vpholding of Papistry, Which Is Falselie Termed the Catholike Religion* (Oxford, 1604), 232. Abbot writes, "And for Calvine that since for manye yeares, hee lived in so reverende reputation at Geneva, vvhere they are so strict against sinne, that by the testimony of Bodine a Papist, no open wantonnes, no lasciviousnesse is once permitted there, by reason of the austerity of their discipline." Also, Miles Smith, *Sermons of the Right Reuerend Father in God Miles Smith, Late Lord Bishop of Glocester* (London, 1632).

[54] John Milton, *The Reason of Church-government Urg'd Against Prelaty* (London, 1641), 49. Milton writes, "it will be next to declare wherin the true reason and force of Church censure consists, which by then it shall be laid open to the root, so little is it that I fear lest any crookednes, any wrincle or spot should be found in presbyterial governnient that if Bodin the famous French... though a papist, yet affirms that the Commonwelth which maintains this discipline will certainly flourish in *vertu* and *piety*, I dare assure my self that every true protestant will admire the integrity, the uprightnes, the divine and gracious purposes therof." My Italics.

[55] For example, John Ley writes, "but for promotion of the practise of piety, and prevention of loosenesse of life, as of the Church of *Geneva* is noted, and acknowledged by *Bodine,* a Papist, in the sixth Chapter of his Booke, *de meth, historiae*." John Ley, *The New Quere, and Determination Upon It* (London, 1645), 59.

[56] Robert Filmer, "The Necessity of the Absolute Power of All Kings," in *Patriarcha and Other Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 172n.

attributed this ironic title of being a Genevan Protestant, as it seems to be suggested by Burgess.[57] Some association of Bodin and Genevan church government would have played a role for such a decision, either by Filmer himself or the printer of the *Necessity*.[58] This might also explain why the other version was left anonymous because Bodin's identity as a papist was too clear to some for it to be an effective strategy.

In 1659, Richard Baxter recurred the same example at the end of the Interregnum: "How highly doth *Bodin* a Learned Papist extol the Presbyterian Discipline at *Genevah* from its effects."[59] It is amusing to observe Baxter talking of a '*Learned* Papist,' at last portrayed in a somewhat positive way through mentioning an example with quite a history behind it.

In Burgess's survey of the general image of Bodin, it was this specific quote that illustrated how Bodin was thought to be moderate. Burgess argued that this moderation was the key ingredient to his authority: "Moderate in his religion, Bodin's reputation was also of a man whose political insight led to moderation as well."[60] Yet I hope it is clear by now that Baxter's assessment of Bodin was itself not so impartial—the specific way Baxter positively evaluated Bodin appeared while repeating a deeply partisan example appropriated from Bodin's passage in the *Methodus*. Similar to what Blair has pointed out in Bodin's behavior, these references were often the single reference their authors made to Bodin in a book.

---

[57] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 393.

[58] Another line of inquiry that merits further attention is the relationship between Bodin's natural philosophy and Calvinist natural philosophy. Ann Blair has shown that, although early seventeenth-century Calvinist philosophers have criticized Bodin for his anti-Aristotelianism, "they took the *Theatrum* seriously as a source of original philosophical argument in line with their own objectives." Interestingly, positive references to Bodin's *Theatrum* led German Calvinists to consult Bodin regularly, and with "The collapse of Calvinist philosophy in the 1620s," Blair observes, "ended the academic citations of the *Theatrum*." Blair, *The Theater of Nature*, 189-191, 194.

[59] Richard Baxter, *Five disputations of church-government and worship* (London, 1659), 33.

[60] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 394.

A few general observations can be drawn here. First, in terms of citation strategy, it is clear that the use of Bodin as an *Example* and as an *Authority* or *Icon* are intertwined with each other. In the case of Baxter, Bodin is cited because he is a learned figure, *and* he extols the presbyterian discipline. Compare this with Harsnett's mention of Bodin from above, in which Bodin was a man of melancholy for believing in such 'incredible' tales of the devils.[61] As 'testimonies' and 'tales' were never so free from opinion, the compartmentalization of these categories may not be so helpful to historians of the period.[62] Engaging Bodin's work as a sourcebook was not so far from reading it as an authoritative source of opinion. It is not always so clear whether Bodin is cited because he is a credible authority or because he writes about credible things.[63]

Secondly, one may question whether such use of Bodin's *Methodus* should fall under the category of 'reception,' when it is quite removed from the intention of the author. Bodin's discussion of Geneva was appropriated and repeated by many, creating a small tradition of its own. Such a phenomenon is separable from both acceptance and rejection of a view. It calls for a separate recognition outside the boundary of 'influence,' or perhaps even 'reception.'

Lastly, this further invites us to reconsider the meaning of religio-political 'moderation' in the early modern period. There are, of course, some religious aspects of Bodin that would

---

[61] It is also worth noting that in this treatise, Harsnett was arguing against 'popish' exorcism in general, which "with-draw the harts of her Maiesties subiects from their allegiance… vnder the pretence of casting out deuils." Thus, Harsnett's critique of Bodin is also partly against Bodin's 'popishness' he thought the English share: "This mans cerebrum melancholicum, is a notable forge for our popish Ethnicks." Harsnett, *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*, title and 133.

[62] Even now, 'facts' and 'judgments' in history are not so clearly distinguished. On a recent contention on the relationship between academic historians and their scholarly neutrality, see Donald Bloxham, *History and Morality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020).

[63] Intellectual historians of the early modern period, particularly historians of science, have taken the issue of credibility seriously. See R. W. Serjeantson, "Proof and Persuasion," in Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston eds., *The Cambridge History of Science*: Vol. 3, *Early Modern Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 132-175.

appeal to historians today as 'moderate' in a broad sense. Although it is clear in hindsight that Bodin was deeply interested in religious matters, he was relatively reticent on religious issues, presumably to repress his own heterodox views. Unlike some of the religious radicals of his time, he was much less inclined to demonize Luther or Calvin. He was also known to advocate for some measure of religious toleration.

At the same time, however, these two characteristics—respectful citation of Protestant writers and his advocacy of confessional diversity—were the very traits that led his works being put on the Index.[64] Early modern authors, especially when religious turmoil was acute, were criticized for arguing for such toleration. Thus, 'neutral secularity' was not much of an option in the early modern period. On a more general level, the religion of an author mattered, even when one was not so vocal about it.

On the Catholic side, Robert Persons, in order to justify Rome's decision of listing Bodin's books on the Index, observed that "all sectaries books whatsoeuer are read promiscuously of all men and women… Macheuile & Bodin tending to Atheisme," lamenting "that the peoples iudgment & affections are pittifully infected with poyson in euery kynd where no prohibition is vsed to the contrary."[65] Such a stance seems to have been pretty well known to English protestants as well, providing another chance to use Bodin against those advocating some kind of toleration in protestant England.[66] William Barlow noted how Thomas Stapleton "reuiles Bodin in particular, as an enemie to Christianitie for maintaining that Libertie. Which

---

[64] Malcolm, "Jean Bodin," 148. See also, R. Crahay, "Jean Bodin devant la censure: la condemnation de la "Republique"", in *La 'Republique' di Jean Bodin: atti del convegno di Perugia, 14-15 novembre 1980* (Florence: Olschki, 1981), 154-72.

[65] Robert Persons, *The warn-word to Sir Francis Hastinges wast-word conteyning the issue of three former treateses* (Antwerp, 1602), 68.

[66] For instance, Daniel Featley grouped Bodin together with Persons and other Catholic authors who "joyne hearts and pens, spending the strength of their wit, and flower of their learning in this argument of toleration." Daniel Featley, *Clavis Mystica* (London, 1636), 464.

they conclude to be the Calamitie of a Church… perilous in a State, where there are as many Faithes as Willes, so many Doctrines as Manners."[67]

Ben Jonson's characterization of these same authors is another interesting case: "And then, for your Religion, professe none; But wonder, at the diuersity of all; And, for your part, protest, were there no other But simply the Lawes, o'th' Land, you could content you: Nic: Machiauell, and Monsieur Bodine, both, Were of this minde."[68] Jonson does not directly repeat the reproaches of Catholic authors, but nonetheless groups Bodin and Machiavelli together[69] for their relative lack of religious message.

This is not to rule out the entirety of Bodin's 'moderation.' There were more than a few readers of Bodin who would not have been so vexed by his religion. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine Hobbes to have been keen on Bodin's religious principles in a similar way. In Thomas Fuller's case, too, he appears to favor Bodin's reputation as an "able States-men"[70] over John Saltmarsh's accusation pointing out Bodin's lack of religiosity. What I do believe, however, is that Saltmarsh's accusations were as serious as Fuller's response when Saltmarsh wrote: "You write of the Reformation of a Church like Bodin, not like Bucer; you make it a work of Policy, not of Piety, of Reason not Divinity: such Counsellors… made a Church as unhappy as a Kingdome miserable. This moderation and qualification you speak of, is not so

---

[67] William Barlow, *An Answer to a Catholike English-man* (London, 1609), 118. Outside English contemporaries of Bodin, Traiano Boccalini was also known to have attacked Bodin as an atheist for upholding the liberty of conscience in his *Ragguagli di Parnaso*.

[68] Ben Jonson, *Volpone or The Foxe* (London, 1607), Act 4. Written in the period Ben Jonson remained a Catholic.

[69] Machiavelli and Bodin were also often mentioned together as modern authorities in a less problematic manner. For instance, John Selden mentions both as modern authorities on the issue of precedence between monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy: "Aristotles Commenters, Bodin, Machiauel on Liuy, diuers others disput this point." *Titles of Honor* (London, 1614), 5.

[70] Thomas Fuller, *Truth Maintained, or, Positions Delivered in a Sermon at the Savoy* (London, 1643), 19.

consistent with spirituall essences and operations."[71] I have not found a clear reason for historians to prefer a more neutral reading and representation of Bodin, or to consider these incidents to be mere rhetorical gestures.

Therefore, religious language was, interestingly, one of the most convenient ways for early modern English to curb Bodin's authority, because it was deeply intertwined with the politics of the period. Nor was this strategy employed only against a Royalist figure like Fuller. To provide one other example in the opposite direction, William Prynne picked out an example from Bodin in order to criticize Charles's declaration against Parliament's raising of the army in 1642. To Prynne, the most enthusiastic user of Jean Bodin among the pamphleteers of the English Civil War,[72] Bodin was a figure who had "written much in favour of Kings though degenerated into Tyrants, and so much that he confesseth he was tax'd for it."[73] In return, an anonymous author criticized Prynne for his use of Bodin: "he should be better able to justify this Rebellion (though this case too differs wholly from that there quoted) out of Bodine, then out of the Bible. A Popish Author is fittest to justify that which hath been raised out of Popish Principles."[74] It is remarkable that this anonymous author pays more attention to Bodin's 'popishness' than the exact content of Prynne's quote. This demonstrates again how different aspects of an author, religious disposition in this case, could be employed to fit one's motives—sometimes more emphatically than the actual content of Bodin's usage.

---

[71] Saltmarsh implies that Bucer correctly persuaded Edward "to build up a perfect Church," while "our *Marian* times approach too fast"—like Bucer's prophecy almost a century before. He also remarks that such moderation was not found in either Elizabeth and Henry VIII. John Saltmarsh, *Examinations, or, a Discovery of Some Dangerous Positions Delivered in a Sermon of Reformation Preached in the Church of the Savoy* (London, 1643), 4-5.

[72] It should be noted that Prynne, like how Filmer is known to have read and used Bodin before the Civil War, was citing quite extensively from Bodin about policy on stage plays years before the escalation of the conflict. William Prynne, *Histrio-mastix: The Players Scourge, or, Actors Tragœdie* (London, 1633).

[73] William Prynne, *A Moderate and Most Proper Reply to a Declaration, Printed and Published Under His Maiesties Name, December 8* (London, 1642).

[74] Anonymous, A Letter from a Scholler in Oxford-Shire (Oxford, 1642), 14.

IV

If Bodin's reputation for religious moderation deserves closer attention that leads to some reassessments, the reputation of political moderation will warrant some reconsideration as well. In what sense was a political thinker deemed 'moderate'? Again, I am not sure whether such a status was available in the partisan atmosphere of the Civil War period. As the quote above by Prynne demonstrates, Bodin was often assumed to be a figure whose ideas were to be favored by royalists. This was also how Eleutherius Philodemius referred to Bodin, as a "great kingsman."[75]

There was good reason for such a conception. It was readily observed by both Royalists and Parliamentarians that, in his *République*, Bodin explicitly and repeatedly stated the English king to be an absolute sovereign in the pivotal passages where he related to the possibility of just resistance to a tyrant. On the question of resisting a tyrant, Bodin distinguished between when the tyrant held absolute sovereignty and when the tyrant was merely a limited monarch. It was lawful to proceed against a tyrant when the tyrant was a merely limited figure, that is, when sovereignty was vested in the people or in the nobility. When subjects were under an absolute sovereign, however, they were not allowed to resist their sovereign.[76] Thus, according to Bodin and many other Royalists[77] who cited the same passage from the fifth chapter of the second book of the *République*,[78] resistance against the English monarch was not justifiable in

[75] Eleutherius Philodemius, *The Armies Vindication* (London, 1649), 49. From Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 403.
[76] Jean Bodin, *The Six Books of a Commonweale*. Translated by Richard Knolles (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), Bk. II. Ch. 5., 220-2.
[77] For example, David Owen, *Anti-parœus, or, a Treatise in the Defence of the Royall Right of Kings Against Parœus* (York, 1642), 15. Examples can be multiplied, including Filmer's *Necessity of the Absolute Power* mentioned above.
[78] This passage has also been pivotal evidence to many modern scholars who thought of Bodin as an absolutist thinker and his *République* as an absolutist text. On the *République* as an absolutist intervention amidst the French wars of religion, see Julian H. Franklin, *Jean Bodin and the Rise of Absolutist Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

England. After all, there was some good reason for Philip Hunton, one of the main pamphleteers for the Parliamentary cause, not to make an open mention of Bodin, although historians have noted that Hunton would have been well aware of the implications of the doctrine of legislative sovereignty.[79]

Of course, Bodin's *République* was essentially a different type of work from the polemical pamphlets of the English Civil War. Daniel Lee has recently reemphasized that Bodin's *République* was not simply a polemic of the French religious wars, a *livre de circonstance*, but primarily an academic treatise. Bodin "wasn't concerned with particulars [*singulorum*] or the affairs of any one particular state, even his native France. He was only concerned with universals [*universorum*], the affairs common to all states."[80] As a complex, subtle, and ingeniously composed piece, the *République* did contain parts that could argue against simple monarchical supremacy.[81] There was much value to borrow from such a work of high caliber, by "a grave politician." But this quality did not ensure its 'moderation.' As a case to the contrary, in France, Bodin's thoughts were "absorbed into the absolutist current… into the doctrine of the divine right of kings"[82] If, according to Burgess, "it is not surprising… that Bodin's political writing was cited in support of arguments presented by Royalists, Parliamentarians," and others, why does he also find the "defenders of the Parliamentary cause" to be, "on the face of it, least likely expected" to use Bodin?[83]

---

[79] Salmon, *Legacy of Jean Bodin*, 519. Also, Margaret A. Judson, *The Crisis of the Constitution: An essay in constitutional political thought in England 1603-1645* (New York: Octagon Books, 1964) 401. Hunton's reticence is also partly because Hunton's diagnosis of England as a mixed constitution was diagonally opposite to Bodin's principle of the indivisibility of sovereignty.
[80] Lee, *The Right of Sovereignty*, 32.
[81] To this end, Salmon has collected the 'ambiguities of Jean Bodin' from which his followers expanded their stances. Salmon, *Legacy of Jean Bodin*, 501-4.
[82] Ibid., 500, 505-6.
[83] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 394-5, 401.

Instead of delving into how Parliamentarians had to bypass these central passages of Bodin when using his works, Burgess notes that William Prynne quoted Bodin as a supporter of resistance, "conveniently ignoring the fact that the passage he quoted referred only to kings who were not absolute."[84] True, Bodin distinguished absolute monarchy and limited ones, and Prynne, unlike how he fashioned Bodin in his shorter pamphlet, presented Bodin differently in his longer treatise. But Prynne's treatment of Bodin throughout his *The Soveraigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes* is at least consistent with his basic argument that the English parliament "in this regard is the most Soveraigne Authority, and greater in jurisdiction than the King."[85] He did not ignore Bodin's diagnosis of England as a state of absolute monarchy; he simply disagreed with it, though less openly. This is all the more clear because Prynne extended this argument to all kingdoms in the appendix, that "the Supreame Soveraignty and Power, resided not in the Emperours and Kings themselves but in their Kingdomes, Senates, Parliaements, People."[86] To this end, Prynne quoted repeatedly from the *République* on the forms of the Roman Empire and the German Empire, as the foremost cases where Bodin held sovereignty not to be vested in the prince.[87]

Some historians, however, have not seen Prynne as consistent in his treatment of the problem of sovereignty. Both William Lamont and Burgess cited the following passage to remark that this is odd because it suggests that "he was citing Bodin "precisely to show that sovereignty was the concept which Parliament was avoiding in its claim.""[88]: "*Iohn Bodin* a grand Polititian, truely determines and proves at large, *That it is not the right of election of*

---

[84] Ibid., 402.
[85] William Prynne, *The Soveraigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes Divided Into Foure Parts* (London, 1643), Part I, 46.
[86] Ibid., Part IV, Appendix.
[87] Ibid., Part I, 105-6; Part II, 9, 11. This includes "most forraign Christian Kingdoms" such as "Sweden, Denmarke *and* Norway."
[88] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 403. From William Lamont, *Marginal Prynne: 1600-1669* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), 104-5.

great Officers, which declareth the right of Soveraignty, because this oft is, and may be in the Subjects, but the Princes approbation, and confirmation of them when they are chosen, without which they have no power at all. It can then be no usurpation at all in the Parliament upon the Kings *Prerogative,* to nominate or elect his Councellours, great Officers, and Iudges, or recommend meet persons to him (which is all they require) so long as they leave him a Power to approve and ratifie them by Writs or speciall Patents, in case he cannot justly except against them; Of which power they never attempted to divest his Majesty, though he be no absolute, but only a politick King, as *Fortescue* demonstrates."[89] To be sure, I do believe this is not the most lucid way of citing an author, and I also agree with Lamont's diagnosis of Prynne's work that it was hastily prepared and failed to be coherent throughout. I even concede that this demonstrates "Prynne's confused approach to sovereignty," between the theoretical principles of absolute sovereignty and his hope of not portraying the parliament as the instigator of the conflict. But this passage still cannot be the evidence that Prynne was avoiding parliament's claim for sovereignty, because it is firmly established as an issue outside the marks of sovereignty and maintains the king to only be a "politick King," not an absolute one.

Thus, when an anonymous author criticized Prynne for misquoting Bodin, referring to Bodin's passage on how the English king was an absolute sovereign,[90] Prynne could unhesitatingly insist that he refuted this "error" from Bodin that English Kings were absolute sovereigns.[91] Royalists, on the other hand, were keen on reinforcing Bodin's authority in English affairs: as Griffith Williams writes, "John Bodin that had very exactly learned the

---

[89] Prynne, *The Soveraigne Power*, Part II, 45. His Italics.

[90] Anonymous, *The Fallacies of Mr. William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted: In a Short View of His Late Bookes Intituled, the Soveraignty of Parliaments* (Oxford, 1644), 3-4. Prynne argues that this pamphlet was printed in London.

[91] William Prynne, *The Falsities and Forgeries of the Anonymous Author of a Late Pamphlet, (Supposed to Be Printed at Oxford but in Truth at London) 1644. Intituled the Fallacies of Mr. William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted* (London, 1644), 2.

nature of our parliament… both by his reading and conferring with our English Embassador (as himselfe confesseth) saith, the States of England are never otherwise assembled, (no more then they are in the Realmes of France and Spaine)… and the states have no power of themselves to determine or decree any thing… without expresse commandement from the king."[92] This is particularly interesting in contrast to how Sutcliffe once noted Bodin's ignorance of the situation of England.

Somewhat similar to religious 'moderation,' then, the polemical value of *République* existed not so much in its presumed political 'moderation' as in a clear statement of absolute monarchy in England with elements that could be turned against itself. Prynne's move was to argue how such an absolute monarchy never existed in any kingdom in history. This could have been at odds with the established constitutional norms of England, yet it was nevertheless maintained throughout his work. It resembled how Althusius turned the Bodinian doctrine of inalienable, indivisible sovereignty on its head by arguing that "sovereignty remained in some sense in the community as a whole." Salmon has once noted how Prynne "misrepresented" the original meaning of these passages,[93] but from the perspective of 'reception,' Prynne rather selectively appropriated from Bodin to suit his purpose, including Bodin's judgment on Rome and Germany but not on England. Such use of Bodin is an interesting picture in contrast to how Bodin was received in France. In my view, Baxter's assessment of Bodin as a 'moderate' figure two decades after the interregnum[94] appears to be the *consequence* of the political turmoil of the Civil War which motivated Parliamentarians such as Prynne to put forward their critical *uses* of Bodin like their contemporary authors, and not the *cause* of their interest in Bodin.[95]

---

[92] Griffith Williams, *The Discovery of Mysteries* (Oxford, 1643), 79-80.
[93] Salmon, *Legacy of Jean Bodin*, 507-8, 517-8.
[94] Richard Baxter, *The Second Part of the Nonconformists Plea for Peace* (London, 1680), 128.
[95] Many of the passages that parliamentarians bring to our attention, such as limitations to sovereign authority, are the parts modern scholars are also showing some interest in their reconsideration of Bodin's standing as an absolutist thinker. On the more recent attempts to

V

Finally, to return to the question of locating Hobbes's sole reference to Bodin, it should be questioned what kind of citation it was and whether there was any intermediary that shaped Hobbes's reading of Bodin. In the *Elements of Law*, Hobbes writes: "The third opinion. That the Soueraigne power may be divided, is noe lesse an Errour then the former, as hath bene proued. *Part*: 2. Chapt: I. *Sect*: 15. And if there were a Common wealth, where in the rightes of Soueraignty were divided. We must confesse wth Bodin. *lib*: 2. *Cap*. I. *De Repub*: that they are not Rightly to be called Commonwealthes, but the Corruption of Commonwelathes."[96]

In the quote, Hobbes uses Bodin to make a rather specific point about a characteristic of sovereignty. Bodin is invoked as an authority to be agreed with. To what extent can this reference be identified or aligned with the uses of Bodin that precede it?

One close citation of Bodin apt for comparison is the *Golden-groue* of William Vaughan. In 1600, Vaughan also cited the same chapter of Bodin's *République* as Hobbes: the first chapter of the second book. In the same manner Bodin treated the types of commonwealths in the chapter, Vaughan cleared the board by invoking Bodin's authority: "IT was a great controuersie among politicians, about the diuision of a Common-wealth; for some would allow but of two sorts: some contrarie appoynted foure, and others fiue. Polybius accounted seuen. Bodinus, whose iudgement is most of all applauded, approoueth onely those three speciall kindes of a Commonwealth, which Aristotle hath mentioned."[97] On the definition of a commonwealth, however, Vaughan did not follow Bodin's definition or even mention it.[98]

question this tendency, see Jiangmei Liu, "Beyond the Legacy of Absolutism: Re-examining Jean Bodin's Idea of Anti-Tyranny Violence." *The European Legacy* 30, No. 1 (2025): 24-43.

[96] Thomas Hobbes, *Elements of Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2024), 264-5.

[97] William Vaughan, *The Golden-groue Moralized in Three Bookes* (London, 1600), Book III. Ch. 2.

[98] I doubt if it was possible for Vaughan to be entirely ignorant of Bodin's general argument. Even if this was the case, however, his attitude differs significantly from the post-Civil War

Vaughan provided instead a quite conventional and arguably Aristotelian definition of a commonwealth: "A Common-wealth is a societie of free mē, vnited together by a generall consent, to the end to liue well and orderly, not onely in regard of iustice, but also of commoditie, and for the preseruation of themselues, as well in peace, as in warre. The which is a thing naturall, both in respect of parts, to wit, a shire, a parish, and a family, whereof a Commonwealth is the accomplishment: and of men naturally disposed to liue in societie."[99]

Therefore, it is not difficult to discern the difference between Vaughan's commonwealth and Hobbes's, although they both cite the same chapter in Bodin and refer to Bodin in a similarly sparing fashion.[100] Around Vaughan's timing of writing, generally speaking, the main contentions of Bodin's *République* were yet to be seriously considered in England. In contrast, Hobbes's discussion of sovereignty and the more legislative capacity of that sovereignty which immediately follows his citation of Bodin does seem to corroborate Bodinian 'influence' in Hobbes's thought. Thus, I do agree with Burgess on a general level that Bodin's definition of a commonwealth, that is, identifying a 'commonwealth' through a lens of sovereignty, took off in England at some point in the mid-seventeenth century.

At the same time, however, this is far short of a full explanation of "Hobbes's decision to quote Bodin in the *Elements of Law*."[101] It was one thing to argue that sovereignty is the defining characteristic of a commonwealth, and still another thing to argue that this sovereignty cannot be divided or shared between a sovereign and its subjects. Both of these citations, therefore, are not solely interested in defining a commonwealth. Hobbes was interested in arguing for the indivisibility of sovereignty, and Vaughan upheld the three types of

---

authors who became much aware of the implications of sovereignty within a commonwealth, either through Bodin's words or those of others such as Hobbes or Grotius.

[99] Ibid., Third book, Book III. Ch. I.

[100] Vaughan also does not mention Bodin any further in his main body of the text, except once in a marginal note, where he quotes a sentence.

[101] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 405.

commonwealths that were, in Bodin's eyes, a corollary of taking that indivisibility of sovereignty seriously.

On the whole, it occurs to me that Burgess's interest in the 'influence' of Bodin and the limit of space has prevented him from paying closer attention to the different aspects of the theory of sovereignty, which varied in many forms. For instance, Burgess has noted how authors used Bodin for a fairly narrow "list of topics on which his views were deemed relevant—absolute sovereignty, tyranny, mixed monarchy, resistance, limitations to sovereign authority, and sometimes ecclesiastical discipline (especially Genevan)."[102] However, I remain unconvinced that this is a particularly narrow list when Burgess set out to focus on the political treatises of the period. Nor do the uses of Bodin in matters of political power appear to be satisfactorily captured under the single heading of 'absolute sovereignty.' For instance, does this heading include Bodin's discussion of patriarchal power,[103] which was so emphasized by Filmer[104] but also addressed by Henry Parker?[105] This does not seem to be the case.

In the *République*, Bodin questioned what makes a polity a 'commonwealth.' Among others, he concluded that 'sovereignty' ought to be the deciding factor of a commonwealth.[106]

---

[102] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 395.

[103] For an example of such usage before the English Civil War, Robert Jenison already alluded to three examples from the *République*, while pointing out "Bodines error" that the father may take his children's lives. Robert Jenison, *Idolaters Blinde Zeale* (London, 1621), 4-5.

[104] Filmer recognizes that Bodin's conception of paternal power "doth seem in one place to confine it to a house." But Filmer also contends that "in his definition he doth enlarge his meaning," and borrows Roman anecdotes and Roman law from Bodin that corroborate this power. Robert Filmer, "Patriarcha" in *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, 16, 18-9. The dating of the earliest manuscript of *Patriarcha* has been disputed, but from the existing evidence, Tuck's dating of it before 1631 seems most plausible. See xxxii of the same volume.

[105] Parker, on the contrary, remarks how Bodin, though "very zealous for Paternall empire… in this, doth not aime at the totall cure of Contention in the State." Parker satirically adds, "his only ambition is, to ease the publique Courts, and to fill private houses with more vexations and unnaturall contestations." Parker further turns down Bodin's "appeal" to Deuteronomy by noting "for the very words of the Law there, give the definitive sentence to the Elders, and the execution to the whole City." Henry Parker, *Jus Populi* (London, 1644), 34.

[106] Bodin, *Commonweale*, Bk. I. Ch. 6., 49E.

Bodin further characterized sovereignty to be absolute,[107] indivisible, and inalienable.[108] In juristic terms, he then listed what would count as the marks of sovereignty, foremostly the power to give laws and exemplarily the power to wage war or make peace.[109] Of course, Bodin treated these issues as related to each other, and in the course of application of his ideas on existing states, they all had to be mentioned in one way or another. In principle, however, they were separate issues that were not always merged into 'absolute sovereignty.' Nor did these issues receive a uniform amount of interest; in the German Empire, for instance, the indivisibility of sovereignty received particular interest.[110]

This supplies the more immediate context of Hobbes's quote of Bodin, if we see Hobbes's quotation of Bodin as one preoccupied with the necessity of undivided sovereignty. Academic jurists, mostly from parts of the German Empire, were alarmed by the implications of Bodin's notion of the indivisibility of sovereignty. This posed a particular challenge for German jurists because Bodin, denying the possibility of a mixed constitution, characterized the German Empire as aristocratic in nature and its emperor as without sovereign authority. On this matter, Julian Franklin has put together the various modes of reactions regarding the constitution of the German Empire, until Christoph Besold finally posited that the rights of sovereignty could be shared while denying the strict principles of indivisibility in his 1626 publication, "De reipublicae statu mixto."[111]

In terms of its details, I have little to add to Franklin's classic overview. In terms of its approach, however, it is worth pointing out that Franklin's basic stance toward the concept of

---

[107] Ibid., Bk. I. Ch. 8., 84I.
[108] Ibid., Bk. I. Ch. 10., 153C, 155C-D.
[109] Ibid., Bk. I. Ch. 10., 159E, 162H.
[110] Julian H. Franklin, "Sovereignty and the Mixed Constitution: Bodin and His Critics," in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie eds., *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 298-328. Also, Salmon, *Legacy of Jean Bodin*, 501-2.
[111] Franklin, "Sovereignty and the Mixed Constitution," 310-1, 324.

indivisibility makes it difficult to link his research with later developments in the reception of Bodin. From the beginning of his chapter, Franklin notes that Bodin's account of sovereignty was "primarily responsible for introducing the seductive but *erroneous* notion that sovereignty is indivisible." To Franklin, such an opinion was an error, "mistaken," ever waiting to be exposed because it was and is at odds with constitutional realities and perhaps our present belief in the separation of powers. Thus, with Besold exposing the "error" of Bodin and presenting an alternative, "*adequate* formula for the German constitution," Franklin sees the issue closed in principle, and passes over the rest, as "it lingered on in one form or another."[112]

Such a retrospective gaze is problematic in many ways. Not only does it downsize the independent or inventive role played by the recipients (Franklin uses the word "follower") in the process of developing their challenges, which were unforeseen by their precursor but it also renders other 'followers' of Bodin to be simply persisting in his error without enough contemplation. On the contrary, on the English side, this issue was far from sufficiently resolved. Royalists like Filmer[113] and Hobbes were eager to argue for an undivided sovereignty to reside on the King's side, at least in England. Parliamentarians, on the other hand, were not always keen on criticizing this notion of undivided sovereignty and advocating a mixed kind of constitution. Prynne does not demonstrate a coherent attitude throughout, but generally speaking, he does seem to be closer to arguing for the sovereignty to be vested in "the parliament" as a whole.[114]

---

[112] Ibid., 298, 303, 323. My Italics.

[113] Whose stance is clear from the title of his treatise in 1648, *The Anarchy of a Limited or Mixed Monarchy*.

[114] Prynne does quote parts from Bodin that are the basis of undivided sovereignty: "*For if a Prince he bound not to make any Lawes, without the consent of a greater than himselfe, he is then a very Subject: if not without his equall, he then hath a Companion* (as *Bracton* and others forecited, say our *English* King hath; namely his Earles and Lords, thence stiled *Comites:) if not without the consent of his inferiours, whether it be of his Subjects, or of the Senate, or of the People; he is then no Soveraigne.*" Prynne, *The Soveraigne Power*, Part I, 46.

Thus, while this continental context is to some extent a proper pretext for Hobbes's decision to quote Bodin, it is again short of a satisfactory explanation, especially if we follow Franklin's account. Hobbes, writing more than a decade after Besold, was quite removed from the dispute, because his interests in the *Elements of Law* were not so identical to the academic disputes that took place in foreign lands. Fully composed in his English prose, Hobbes's *Elements of Law* was a piece that responded to the English situation.[115] In this respect, one rather unexpected—or perhaps not entirely surprising—English text that helps us more clearly elucidate the background of the quote appears to be Richard Knolles's 1606 translation of the *République* itself, which corresponds almost word for word to Hobbes's quotation.

Here, one smaller difference between the citations of Vaughan and Hobbes is worth pointing out. Vaughan's citation directly followed the main argument of Bodin's chapter, which was the contention that there could only be three types of commonwealths, and there could not be a commonwealth with a mixed constitution where sovereignty was shared. In other words, there was no afterthought of any kind in Vaughan's use of Bodin. On the other hand, the specific sentence[116] that Hobbes cited from Bodin was slightly chosen out of context, because Bodin's argument in the chapter Hobbes cited was less focused on the qualities of sovereignty, such as indivisibility. If Hobbes purely wished to write on the qualities of sovereignty, against the "Errour" that "the Soueraigne power may be divided,"[117] there was much reason to quote from

---

[115] Historians have disputed the exact timing of the composition of the *Elements of Law*. Although Hobbes gave his own account of how the work was composed twenty years later, after the interregnum, there seems to be no definitive evidence on the issue because the details of the original manuscripts do not align well with Hobbes's self-fashioning. Some historians, such as Richard Tuck and Deborah Baumgold have argued that it was hastily composed in order to serve its goals of being used in the discussions of the Short Parliament, yet others have disagreed. Nevertheless, it is difficult to dispute that the *Elements of Law* reflect Hobbes's interests in English politics, be it the proceedings of the short parliament or the events that precede it, such as the ship money case or the parliaments of 1628-9. J. P. Sommerville, "General Introduction," in *Elements of Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2024), 1-18.

[116] Bodin, *Commonweale*, 194K.

[117] Hobbes, *Elements*, 264.

chapter ten of the first book of *République*, where Bodin not only related to "the true markes of soueraigntie," but also noted that its "markes" could not be shared with his subjects, unless one no longer was the sovereign.[118]

Therefore, to see how Hobbes's first two sentences are connected, it is useful to consider the chapter's overall aim. In this part of the book, Hobbes was arguing against "Pretences to Rebellion."[119] Hobbes was thus making the connection that the opinion that sovereignty may be divided was itself a pretense leading to rebellion; he was seeking an authority who would best illustrate this relation. In this sense, Bodin's discussion of actual quarrels within countries where sovereignty was supposedly divided, right before the sentence Hobbes was copying almost verbatim, would have caught his attention. It is also notable that Knolles added, next to that sentence, a marginal note of his own that was absent from both the French and Latin originals of the *République*: "To diuide the rights of soueraigntie *daungerous* to all commonweals."[120]

Although there is not enough evidence to fully recover the intention of Hobbes's use of Bodin, it would not be a mere coincidence that his specific quote appears to be a somewhat extended version of Knolles's marginal note. If this claim can be accepted, it further points to the fact that the act of translating and editing is itself an act of reception that has its own impact. Of course, Knolles's translation, combining both the Latin and French versions of the *République*, has already been deemed "a work of independent judgment."[121] However, the impact of such an intervention on the later readers of Bodin has not been so concretely identified in the reception studies of Bodin. This paper, too, is far from being able to suggest any generalizable claims on Knolles, but it posits that such a form of reception was possibly a

---

118 Bodin, *Commonweale*, Bk. I. Ch. 10., 153C, 155C-D.
119 Hobbes, *Elements*, 260.
120 Bodin, *Commonweale*, 194K. My Italics.
121 Kenneth Douglas McRae, "Introduction," in *Commonweale*, A38.

source of another ‘influence’ over how the original was received—perhaps a complicated labyrinth of intertextuality.

VI

To conclude, this paper began by laying out some of the advantages that were supposedly brought about by a focus on reception. Still, it also acknowledges that such a turn has revealed as many challenges as advantages. Firstly, as with all historical research, tracing ‘reception’ also faces an evidential problem of the overrepresentation of some and the underrepresentation of others. Although this may involve many levels of evidential biases, the biggest factor that led to an overrepresentation of certain topics of the period was arguably the English Civil War itself. Neither Burgess’s chapter nor this study, even if for a lesser degree, would be exempt from such bias. Secondly, it is not so clear how we should bring together many strands of ‘reception’ into a study, and it seems that only the individual or the text brings some sense of unity as the principal object of inquiry. Unlike a focus on influence, in which the intention of a chronologically and geographically specified source of influence provides a stronger core of ideas to look for, a study of reception attempts to incorporate diverse and varied attitudes of the recipients dispersed throughout time and space. In these cases, ‘reception’ is often used as an umbrella term, but it is perhaps too wide a term that sometimes obscures the many levels of ‘reception,’ from reading and accepting to confronting and appropriating in print.

Perhaps this study on the uses of Bodin has also been unfortunately diffuse and unfocused. Where does the admittedly microscopic review of Hobbes’s quotation bring us? What are the merits of carrying out such a close look at the ‘uses’ of Bodin that are, in fact, pointing historians toward dizzying directions, without an overarching structure, tendency, or pattern as worthy of the ‘grand change’ that Bodin’s theory of sovereignty was supposedly bringing about?

Even in the relatively focused aspects of discussion such as religion, it is difficult to determine what to make of it as a whole. It poses a general question about how to integrate the variant, irregular, and wide-ranging *appropriations* of past texts. Were these appropriations from Bodin in the religious sphere inadvertent readings or misapplications of texts deemed important? Can and should historians select and prioritize certain readings of specific texts, motivated by 'beliefs' that do not permit a clear explanation? It seems problematic to regard as trivial the things that contemporaries thought important in retrospect. Yet if not, how are these to be brought together with other readings that focus on other eclectic elements?

This study does not offer a complete or definitive answer to these questions, which call for a more thorough reflection on our approaches and methodologies toward 'reception.' Yet it will be of some value to note that its findings can be kept at a certain distance from 'influence' or simple 'reception.' Such cases of 'appropriation,' moreover, reflect the intellectual culture and the religio-political milieu of the period. Bodin's image and reputation were open to some 'manipulation,' depending on the specific context and purpose of his users. At the same time, these references were not entirely free-floating ones; it is possible to identify reproductions of certain uses of Bodin that left their marks on print. This was possible because in this period contemporaries read and utilized Bodin from a certain distance and also through other intermediaries that characterized him in certain ways.

Burgess implies the force of Bodinian 'influence' when he characterizes "Bodin's citation by constitutionalist Royalists" to be "a cuckoo's egg into the nest. Sooner or later, eggs hatch and chicks grow, in the case of cuckoos often to dwarf their surrogate parents and the nest alike."[122] Yet, it is not pointed out in this simile that the constitutionalist Royalists themselves could have thought of Bodin's work as a cuckoo's egg, as a somewhat disparate

[122] Burgess, "Bodin in the English Revolution," 400.

source appropriated for their specific purposes. This might explain why some of the users of Bodin in the early phase of the debate were more ready to fully agree with Bodin when there arose a specific opportunity to use it against one another, such as in the Royalist writings against those of Parliamentarians like Prynne. To some extent, our understanding of Bodin, which seems quite susceptible to simplification, also resembles their uses of Bodin that dwell on a few specific issues.

In this sense, this plurality would not necessarily be undesirable. Salmon once remarked how Johann Sommerville "deplored the tendency to attribute the reception in England of ideas about legislative sovereignty solely to the reading of Bodin's Commonweal."[123] It is also deplorable if the uses of Bodin in the early seventeenth century are simplified as a tug of war between partisan interests, each arguing for royal or parliamentary sovereignty. Burgess also gestures in this direction, suggesting that it was more than just a "game of uses," but without much specificity. His chapter on Bodin includes many instances in which Bodin was cited to fit one's purposes; still, the chapter is less clear on why and how such usage was happening. On the side of 'reception,' Burgess's chapter rather focuses on the general images of Bodin in the political writings of the period, which were sometimes created in this period inversely through certain ways of reading him. It is not so trivial, then, that seventeenth-century English readers of Bodin read, cited, and appropriated Bodin for specific ends, including Hobbes himself.

[123] Salmon, *Legacy of Jean Bodin*, 514.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Scholarly Edited Texts

Bodin, Jean. *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*. Translated by Beatrice Reynolds. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

Bodin, Jean. *The Six Books of a Commonweale: A Facsimile Reprint of the English Translation of 1606, Corrected and Supplemented in the Light of a New Comparison with the French and Latin Texts*. Translated by Richard Knolles. Edited by Kenneth Douglas McRae. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Bodin, Jean. *On Sovereignty: Four Chapters from Six Books of the Commonwealth*. Edited by Julian H. Franklin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Filmer, Robert. *Patriarcha and Other Writings*. Edited by Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Hobbes, Thomas, *Elements of Law*. Edited by Johann P. Sommerville. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2024.

From Early English Books Online

Abbot, George. *Exposition Vpon the Prophet Ionah*. London, 1600.

Abbot, George. *The Reasons Which Doctour Hill Hath Brought, for the Vpholding of Papistry, Which Is Falselie Termed the Catholike Religion*. Oxford, 1604.

Abbot, Robert. *A Wedding Sermon Preached at Bentley in Darby-Shire*. London, 1608.

Adams, Thomas. *A Commentary or, Exposition Vpon the Diuine Second Epistle Generall*. London, 1633.

Anonymous. *A Letter from a Scholler in Oxford-Shire*. Oxford, 1642.

Anonymous, *The Fallacies of Mr. William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted: In a Short View of His Late Bookes Intituled, the Soveraignty of Parliaments*. Oxford, 1644.

Barlow, William. *An Answer to a Catholike English-man*. London, 1609.

Barrow, Henry. *A Petition Directed to Her Most Excellent Maiestie*. London, 1591.

Baxter, Richard. *Five Disputations of Church-Government and Worship*. London, 1659.

Baxter, Richard. *The Second Part of the Nonconformists Plea for Peace*. London, 1680.

Bernard, Richard. *A Guide to Grand-Iury Men*. London, 1627.

Brightman, Thomas. *A Revelation of the Apocalyps*. Amsterdam, 1611.

Crompton, Willilam. *A Wedding-Ring, Fitted to the Finger of Euery Paire That Haue or Shall Meete in the Feare of God*. London, 1632.

Donne, John. *Pseudo-martyr*. London, 1610.

Dupleix, Scipion. *The Resoluer; or Curiosities of Nature*. London, 1635.

Featley, Daniel. *Clavis Mystica*. London, 1636.

Fulbecke, William. *The Second Part of the Parallele*. London, 1602.

Fuller, Thomas. *Truth Maintained, or, Positions Delivered in a Sermon at the Savoy*. London, 1643.

Hakewill, George. *An Answere to a Treatise Written by Dr. Carier*. London, 1616.

Hakewill, George*, An Apologie of the Power and Prouidence of God in the Gouernment of the World*. Oxford, 1627.

Harsnett, Samuel. *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*. London, 1603.

Jenison, Robert. *Idolaters Blinde Zeale*. London, 1621.

Jonson, Ben. *Volpone or The Foxe*. London, 1607.

Ley, John. *The New Quere, and Determination Upon It*. London, 1645.

Malynes, Gerard. *Consuetudo, Vel Lex Mercatoria*. London, 1622.
Milton, John. *The Reason of Church-government Urg'd Against Prelaty*. London, 1641.
Misselden, Edward. *The Circle of Commerce*. London, 1623.
Parker, Henry. *Jus Populi*. London, 1644.
Persons, Robert. *The Warn-word to Sir Francis Hastinges Wast-word Conteyning The Issue of Three Former Treateses*. Antwerp, 1602.
Pemberton, William. *The Charge of God and the King to Iudges and Magistrates*. London, 1619.
Philodemius, Eleutherius. *The Armies Vindication*. London, 1649.
Prynne, William. *Histrio-mastix: The Players Scourge, or, Actors Tragœdie*. London, 1633.
Prynne, William. *A Moderate and Most Proper Reply to a Declaration, Printed and Published Under His Maiesties Name, December 8*. London, 1642.
Prynne, William. *The Soveraigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes Divided Into Foure Parts*. London, 1643.
Prynne, William. *The Falsities and Forgeries of the Anonymous Author of a Late Pamphlet, (Supposed to Be Printed at Oxford but in Truth at London) 1644. Intituled the Fallacies of Mr. William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted*. London, 1644.
Saltmarsh, John. *Examinations, or, a Discovery of Some Dangerous Positions Delivered in a Sermon of Reformation Preached in the Church of the Savoy*. London, 1643.
Selden, John. *Titles of Honor*. London, 1614.
Sutcliffe, Matthew. *An Ansvvere to a Certaine Libel Supplicatorie*. London, 1592.
Vaughan, William. *The Golden-groue Moralized in Three Bookes*. London, 1600.

Secondary Sources

Books

Baxandall, Michael. *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
Blair, Ann. *The Theater of Nature: Jean Bodin and Renaissance Science*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
Blair, Ann. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before Modern Age.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010.
Brett, Annabel. "Political Thought." In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern European History, 1350-1750*. Vol. 2, *Cultures and Power*, 29-55. Hamish Scott ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2015.
Brown, John L. *The Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem of Jean Bodin: A Critical Study*. Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1939.
Bouwsma, William J. *The Waning of the Renaissance, 1550-1640*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.
Burns, J. H. and Mark Goldie eds. *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
Burgess, Glenn and Charles W. A. Prior eds. *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*. Farnham: Routledge, 2011.
Chauviré, Roger. *Jean Bodin, Auteur De La République*. La Fleche: Eug. Besnier, 1914.
Couzinet, Marie-Dominique. *Jean Bodin*. Rome: Memini, 2001.
Denzer, Herausgegeben von Horst ed. *Jean Bodin: Proceedings of the International Conference on Bodin in Munich*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1973.
Elliott, J. H. *History in the Making*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Fell, A. London. *Origins of Legislative Sovereignty and the Legislative State*. Vol. 3, *Bodin's Humanistic Legal System and Rejection of "Medieval Political Theology."* Boston: Oelgeschlager, Gunn, and Hain, 1987.

Franklin, Julian H. *Jean Bodin and the Sixteenth-century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Franklin, Julian H. *Jean Bodin and the Rise of Absolutist Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Franklin, Julian H. ed. *Jean Bodin*. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.

Gilbert, Neal W. *Renaissance Concepts of Method*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Gilmore, Myron Piper. *Humanists and Jurists: Six Studies in the Renaissance*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963.

Goldenbaum, Ursula. "Sovereignty and Obedience." In *The Oxford Handbook of Philsophy in Early Modern Europe*, 500-522. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Grafton, Anthony, "Editing Technical Neo-Latin Texts: Two cases and their Implications." In *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*, page numbers. John Grant ed. New York: AMS Press, 1989.

Havens, Earle. *Commonplace Books: A history of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Judson, Margaret A. *The Crisis of the Constitution: An essay in constitutional political thought in England 1603-1645*. New York: Octagon Books, 1964.

Kelley, Donald R. ed. *History and the Disciplines: The Reclassification of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997.

King, Preston T. *The Ideology of Order: A Comparative Analysis of Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes*. London and Portland: Frank Cass, 1999.

Kristeller, Paul O. *Renaissance thought and Its Sources*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

Lamont, William. *Marginal Prynne: 1600-1669*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963.

Lee, Daniel. *The Right of Sovereignty: Jean Bodin on the Sovereign State and the Law of Nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Lloyd, Howell A ed. *The Reception of Bodin*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Lloyd, Howell A. *Jean Bodin: 'This Pre-eminent Man of France': An Intellectual Biography*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace-books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Parel, Anthony. "Machiavelli's Method and His Interpreters." In *The Political Calculus: Essays on Machiavelli's Philosophy*, 3-32. Anthony Parel ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Salmon, J. H. M. *The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Serjeantson, R. W. "Proof and Persuasion." In Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston eds., *The Cambridge History of Science*: Vol. 3, *Early Modern Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England*. New Haven and London: Yale Universtiy Press, 2000.

Sommerville, J. P. *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640*. London and New York: Longman, 1986.

Skinner, Quentin. *Visions of Politics*. Vol 1. *Regarding Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Journals

Blair, Ann. “Humanist Methods in Natural Philosophy: The Commonplace Book,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 53, No. 4 (1992): 541-551.

Malcolm, Noel. “Jean Bodin and the Authorship of the ‘Colloquium Heptaplomeres.’” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 69 (2006): 95–150.

Moss, Ann. “The Politica of Justus Lipsius and the Commonplace-Book.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59, No. 3 (1998): 421-436.

Lake, Peter. “Puritanism, (Monarchical) Republicanism, and Monarchy; or John Whitgift, Antipuritanism, and the “Invention” of Popularity.” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40, No. 3 (2010): 463-495

Liu, Jiangmei. “Beyond the Legacy of Absolutism: Re-examining Jean Bodin’s Idea of Anti-Tyranny Violence.” *The European Legacy* 30, No. 1 (2025): 24-43.

Morrissey, Mary. “Was John Donne a Catholic?: Conversion, Conformity, and Early Modern English Confessional Identities.” *The Review of English Studies* 74 (2023): 64–77

Salmon, J. H. M. “The Legacy of Jean Bodin: Absolutism, Populism or Constitutionalism?” *History of Political Thought* 17, No. 4 (1996): 500-522.