https://doi.org/10.53656/phil2024-04-06

Political Philosophy
Политическа философия

PRIDE, REASON AND SALVATION. REFLECTIONS ON THE MEANING OF THOMAS MORE'S *UTOPIA*

Prof. Svetoslav Malinov
Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to recover the original intention of Thomas More in creating the fictional island depicted in his book *Utopia*. Drawing on Erasmus' 1519 letter, the author suggests beginning with Book II and analysing it separately from Book I. This approach allows for an exploration of the tension between its *eu*topian and *dys*topian aspects. The claim that through its unique institutions (notably the abolition of private property) Utopia has successfully eliminated pride, deemed the root of all social evils, is scrutinized and revised. While Utopians are neither perfect nor sinless, their religious evolution offers more grounds for optimism than disappointment.

Keywords: Thomas More; Utopia; Christianity; private property; pride

A book that can easily be read in an evening but may require a lifetime to be understood (Marius 1984, p. 153). This is perhaps the most accurate assessment of the small book published in Latin in the autumn of 1516 in Louvain, entitled *The Best State of a Commonwealth and the New Island of Utopia*. We can also read on the cover that it is "a truly golden handbook, no less beneficial as entertaining" and that its author is "the distinguished and eloquent" Thomas More, "citizen and sheriff of the famous city of London". These words mark the beginning of probably the most verbose and still unfinished debate in the history of political thought - the debate over the meaning of Thomas More's *Utopia.* Even without having a clear methodology for gathering evidence, I would venture to say that no book in the history of political thought has enjoyed so numerous and varied interpretations. The "golden handbook" is ambiguous, playful, erudite and ironic on so many levels and in so many directions that any interpreter has to spend a long time explaining which of the existing position he accepts and for what reasons. Perhaps the most powerful tradition created by this highly ambivalent work is that of challenging every element of the book, from its genre to character identity all the way to author's core message. John Ruskin described it wonderfully as 'perhaps the most really mischievous book ever written' (Davis 2011, p. 32

A few examples of these endless debates would suffice to show an excessive diversity leaving no hope for reaching consensus. More created the neologism "utopia" widely accepted for designation of a specific literary genre; and yet there is severe disagreement if his own *Utopia* is *eu*topia (good place) or *dys*topia; following Foucault, some even describe it as "heterotopia" (Leslie 1998, p. 72). More is proclaimed "the progenitor of utopian socialism" and his "golden handbook" has a reserved place in the Marxist tradition; Marx quoted it[1], Karl Kautsky wrote a whole book about it (Kautsky 1888). In 1935, while his name was on an obelisk commemorating the eighteen founders of communism erected on Lenin's orders in post-revolutionary Moscow[2], the Catholic Church[3] canonized Thomas More (Shrank and Withington, 2024, p. 2). Respectively, the *Utopia* of Saint Thomas More turned out to be quite different from that of "comrade" Thomas More. A third *Utopia* has also emerged – that of Sir Thomas More, the brilliant humanist scholar, wise statesman and anti-absolutist martyr (Kristeller 1980; Skinner 1997). There is also a clash over whether the book is a serious philosophical text or a frivolous literary work. C.S. Lewis argued that as long as we take it for a philosophical treatise we would always be on the wrong track. *Utopia* becomes intelligible and delightful "as soon as we take it for what it is - a holiday work, a spontaneous overflow of intellectual high spirits, a revel of debate, paradox, comedy and (above all) of invention, which starts many hares and kills none" (Lewis 1977, p. 390). George Logan so strongly disagrees with the author of the beloved *Chronicles of Narnia* that he dares to accuse him of having committed "the unpardonable sin of trivializing More's impassioned profoundly reflective and enormously learned book as *a jeu d'esprit*" (Logan 2014, p. 5).

On top of the inevitable difficulties caused by historical and cultural distance, stirring up endless interpretative debates, we must add the undisguised intention of the author of *Utopia* himself to conceal, mislead and confuse. Very few persons at the time were better equipped than Thomas More for such a subversive approach. He is addressing an elite audience of fellow humanists, i.e., members of early sixteenth-century European intellectual elite, fluent in Latin and quite advanced in Greek. The text is flooded with signals of interpretative complexities that are deliberately ambiguous and subtle. Even the names of the main characters bring an extra level of sophistication and complication. The story begins with Thomas More being introduced by his friend Peter Giles to Raphael Hythlodaeus, a Portuguese traveller and intellectual (More 1965, 49/20-40)[4]. All three are supposed to be real persons; for the learned reader however the fictional status of the traveller would be immediately obvious from his name. The name Hythlodaeus consists of two Greek words *hythlos* ('idle talk', 'nonsense') plus either *daiein* ('to distribute'), *hodao* ('to sell', 'to trade in') or *daios* (in the rare sense of 'knowing', 'cunning'): hence the possible translation as 'expert in nonsense', "well-learned in nonsense", "expert in trifles". There is no safety in the Latin version of the authors' name either since

Thomas is the name of the sceptical, doubting apostle and "Morus" means "fool". So the enlightened reader is faced with the question of whom to believe – the purveyor of nonsense or the distrustful fool. No clues are provided neither by More, nor by "Morus".

A daring reading suggestion

Considering the enormous and growing burden that is placed on every interpreter of the book, I propose to make an abrupt manoeuvre to get rid of it. Let us go for clarity being ready to pay the price of simplicity. What was never in doubt were More's erudition, intellect and sense of humour. The numerous favourable comparisons between him and the leading mind of the age – Erasmus of Rotterdam – are perfectly natural. There is nothing accidental in the fact that they were friends and co-authors and discussed together the main ideas and events of their time. In 1519, only three years after the publication of *Utopia*. Erasmus wrote to Ulrich von Hutten a letter, entirely dedicated to Thomas More. This letter contains the most truthful description of his friends' appearance, habits, and ideas for that period of his life. We learn from it that More was extremely modest and unpretentious about food and clothing, that he was very fond of joking around, was very protective of his family, and was deeply religious. Here we encounter the explanation of how the book was written and why its structure is so unusual: "He published his *Utopia* for the purpose of showing what are the things that occasion mischief in commonwealths, having the English constitution especially in view, which he so thoroughly knows and understands. He had written the second book at his leisure, and afterwards, when he found it was required, added the first off-hand. Hence there is some inequality in the style" (Erasmus 1918, p. 98).

My suggestion is to trust Erasmus unconditionally, start with Book II which consists of Hythlodaeus' monologue description of Utopia, and read it in isolation from Book I.[5] By beginning in the order in which the book was actually written, we will avoid numerous misguided diversions that are bound to happen if we try to link the complex ideas in the dialogue of Book I directly to the straightforward description of the imaginary island. Let us read Book II as written by a deeply religious paterfamilias who is erudite humanist scholar, temporarily in King's diplomatic service before the Reformation. Let us try to ignore all the subsequent books and events of More's life and especially his martyrdom; let us pass over the complex tangle of politico-philosophical issues in Book I concerning civic virtues, the tension between philosophy and politics, the eternal conflict between *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa.* Although we take some risk of potential shortcomings, the bypassing of complexity should not lead to oversimplification. I believe this approach provides the most appropriate starting point for reproducing More's authentic vision in writing *Utopia.*

Reading the text in this way allows us to break down Book II into three parts. It starts with a direct description of the location and history of the island of Utopia

and its cities, political institutions and population (110 – 135). The second part explains ethical principles and social relations (135 – 217). The third part is focused on the religious beliefs and practices of the Utopians (217 – 245). The only thing we need to know from Book I is the passionate words of Hythlodaeus "that no just or even distribution of goods can be made and that no happiness can be found in human affairs unless private property is utterly abolished" (105/17 – 21). He mentions the island of Utopia as the only place on earth where this principle is applied in practice; the curiosity of Morus is sparked and he wants to learn everything about this incredible place. Hythlodaeus promptly agrees to the request.

Geography, history, political order, occupations (110 – 135)

The tone in the first part is undeniably positive and upbeat. The island is described as a crescent-shaped "like a new moon" (111/12), suggesting hope and hinting at the creative potential of the people living there. The bay stretching between the two ends of the imaginary moon sickle is "sheltered from the winds" (111/14) and is as calm and peaceful as a lake. The inner coast is one great harbour, across which ships pass in every direction, to the great advantage of the people (111/17). On all sides, Utopia is so well protected by nature that a few defenders can rout a numerous enemy fleet (111/20 – 30).

King Utopus, who conquered the island that subsequently took his name, "brought the rude and primitive people to such perfection in culture and science that they now excel all mortals" (113/3 – 6). Thanks to the carefully preserved chronicles of the 1760 years of their history (two facts also worthy of the reader's admiration), we can see the enormous progress that was made in architecture and the arts. The 54 cities of the island are all extensive and magnificent and have the same laws, customs, and language (113/15 – 20). The capital city of Amavroth is chosen as an example; it is well fortified, with beautiful buildings, straight streets, and lovely gardens Everything is built of solid and durable materials, and the windows are protected by glass (123/3), a symbol of luxury and wealth in More's time.

Utopians enjoy a representative system in which power is in the hands of the citizens. It is considered a criminal offence to discuss public affairs outside the senate or the national assemblies - thus conspiracies are excluded and full transparency is ensured. All officials are elected and have fixed terms. The only exception is the governor who is entitled to remain in office for the rest of his life; this is only in force, however, if he performs his duties conscientiously (123/7 – 125/24).

Since there is no privately owned land, "agriculture is the one pursuit that is common to all" (125/27). Besides it, everyone, both women and men, is taught one particular craft as hers or his own. Everybody must work, no one stays idle; because of this Utopians work only six hours per day (127/32) which are more than enough to produce everything needed for a comfortable living. The rest of the day is spent in rest, intellectual pursuits, and entertainment (129/2 – 30). All are guaranteed

housing, clothing and food of equally high quality; there is no greed because nobody wants to amass possessions when everything is provided for. The abolishment of private property combined with their clever labour organisation and education creates a lot of leisure and prosperity for all. At the end of the first the reader is left with the impression that Utopians have built just and stable commonwealth.

Social relations, ethical principles, military affairs (135 – 217)

In the second part of Book II we see the appearance of the first dark spots on the sunny and orderly picture of the perfectly rational organization of Utopia. At the heart of their ethics is the maxim that true happiness lies in pleasure (161/27 – 29) which is divided into two kinds – of the body and of the soul (167/7 – 19). Spiritual pleasures are superior and the highest of them consists in "the intelligence and the sweetness [of the soul] which is bred of contemplation of truth" joined with "the pleasant recollection of a well-spent life and of sure hope of happiness to come" (173/12 – 15). Among the many inferior bodily pleasures, health stands first since it is "the foundation and basis of all pleasures" (173/33 – 38). An intriguing list of "false pleasures" includes devotion to finery and fashions, pursuit of 'ceremonial honours', amassing artefacts and riches, drinking, gambling and hunting (167 – 171).

Within the framework of this moderate hedonism, we encounter some extraordinary customs and practices. Utopians are allowed to commit suicide; moreover, they are encouraged to do so when life turns into a continual 'torture' rather than being a source of pleasure. In cases of incurable and painful disease when a man is "a burden to himself, and a trouble to others" even priests and public officials may advise him to "free himself from this bitter life as from prison" (187/4 – 20). There is nothing unreasonable in this, for one does not put an end to pleasures but to torture (187/14).

"In choosing mates" Utopians follow "a custom which seemed to us very foolish and extremely ridiculous" but is in full accordance with their pleasure ethics (187/36). The right choice of a prospective marriage partner is crucial for a lifetime of happiness because "bodily attractions also are no small enhancement to the virtues of the mind" (189/20). For mutual protection from deception, future husbands and wives should inspect each other completely naked in the presence of respectable older men and women. It is reasonable to eliminate unpleasant surprises and to follow similar procedures when buying horses, for example, where the uncovered body is carefully examined for diseases and deformities.

Without any warning almost carelessly, Hythlodaeus reveals that Utopia is a slave society. Enslaved people perform "all menial offices which to some degree involve heavy labour or soil the hands" (141/33); they are given all unpleasant degrading tasks (like butchering animals, cleaning etc.) so that Utopians can acquire skills, develop their minds, and engage fully with communal life (139/15 – 20). Slaves include prisoners of war, Utopian citizens guilty of serious crimes, criminals

purchased from other countries and poor foreigners who voluntarily choose to be enslaved because living conditions are better (185/15 – 35).

The reasonable policy of evenly distributing the population on the territory of the island and controlling its size leads to violent aggressive behaviour against other countries. If the population throughout the entire island exceeds the fixed quota, Utopians enrol citizens out of every city and plant a colony under their own laws on the mainland near them, wherever the natives have plenty of uncultivated land (137/7 – 11). Those who refuse to live under their laws they drive out of the land they claim for themselves; and against those who resist them, they wage war (137/17 – 20). Utopians think it is perfectly justifiable to make war on people who leave their land waste while others, by the law of nature, ought to be supported from it.

We are told that Utopians detest war, and always try to avoid it (199/39). Actually, they go to war for many reasons: to protect their own land, to establish a new colony, to drive invading armies from the territories of their friends, or to liberate an oppressed people from tyranny and servitude (201/7 – 9). Later we learn that Utopians went to fierce war to avenge a friendly people whose "traders suffered a wrong… under pretence of law" (201/23); surprisingly a commercial dispute also could be a *casus belli*.

Utopians despise silver, gold and precious stones (152/5 – 30); however, they do not deprive themselves of all of these because they know how valuable they are to others. This leads to the paradox that they have more gold at their disposal than the richest and greediest of nations; without any scruples they use it against their enemies. Utopians offer generous rewards for the assassination of enemy leaders; they make lists of the names of all their enemies whose death is also desirable and for which they are ready to pay; the reward is doubled if the victim can be brought alive; the persons who are on the lists are promised money if they commit treason against their country (205/5 – 35). Thanks to their vast reserves of detested precious metals and stones, the Utopians employ mercenaries; their favourites are the Zapoletans – a savage and ferocious mountain people (207/10 – 25). When money does not work, the utopians fuel discord and infighting among their enemies. If even internal dissension subsides, the utopians bully their neighbouring nations into their enemies, digging out some long-forgotten unsettled issues, which are never lacking among kings. On the battlefield, each Utopian soldier is surrounded by his closest relatives and fights to death (210/1 – 10).

Utopian religions (217 – 245)

The last third part of Book II consists of only one chapter entitled "Utopian religions". The plural of the word "religion" contains the most important information on this subject – Utopians have no official common religion. Before his arrival the legendary King Utopus was aware that the natives had fought incessantly over their religious beliefs; it was easy for him to conquer the whole country because

the different sects were more eager to fight one another than to oppose him. It can be expected that after his victory he will try to end religious dissent and impose his religion as compulsory. Instead, "he especially ordained that it should be lawful for every man to follow the religion of his choice", provided this be done moderately, reasonably, without using insults and violence against others (221/3 – 7). Anyone who is too vehement and zealous is punished with exile or enslavement (221/8). The prudent king "was uncertain whether God did not desire a varied and manifold worship" (221/14 – 15); so tolerance reigns over the island.

Although Utopus has left the question of true religion open, yet he has wisely forbidden the belief that the soul perishes with the body and that the world is governed without any plan and providence (221/30 – 35). He who does believe this, the Utopians do not regard as a man, shun him, assign him no duties, and only hope his reason will return. Such a person in fact denies that after this life vices will be punished and virtue rewarded; this is a degradation of the human soul "to the level of a beast's miserable body" (221/37). There are different religions not only on the island as a whole but also in each city. Some worship the sun as a god, others the moon or one of the planets, and still others some man from past ages conspicuous for either virtue or glory (217/8 – 10). Nevertheless, the vast majority "believe in a certain single being, unknown, eternal… far above the reach of the human mind" (217/11 – 14). They call him "father"[6] and to him alone they attribute the origin, increase, progress, changes and ends of all things (217/15 – 17). Reason itself seems to have urged Utopians over the years peacefully to abandon the variety of beliefs and begin to move toward belief in a single supreme being to whom the creation of the universe and providence is due. It is no wonder, therefore, that after hearing from their guests the name of Christ and learning of his teachings, especially the steadfastness in faith of so many martyrs, many of them gladly join Christianity (217/36 – 38).

We know that slaves do the hardest and most degrading work. Surprisingly, there are free citizens who "for religious motives… allow themselves no leisure" (225/27 – 29). In their desire to achieve happiness after death, they voluntarily take on the hardest work without asking for anything in return. Despite putting themselves in the position of slaves, they are greatly respected by others. These people are called "Buthrescae", a word that can be translated as "the religious" (227/25). Among them there are two strands (227/3 – 10) – the first consists of single men only, who deny bodily pleasures, eat no meat, and by hard labour and vigils strive for the future life. The second is more moderate and its members avoid pleasure unless it interferes with their tasks. If the adherents of the first tendency were to attempt to justify their celibacy and vegetarianism by reason, they would become a laughing-stock before their fellow-citizens. However, because they are known to do so because of their religious convictions, they are revered by all. The Utopians regard them "as the holier" acknowledging the others "as the saner" (227/16 – 17).

Utopians regard health as something especially important, since it is the foundation of all that brings bodily pleasure and is a barrier to pain; hence the logic that defines a longer and happier life as more desirable and justifies euthanasia. Following their religious convictions, Utopians reach other conclusions. In their religious songs, they pray that God will take them to himself with a gentle death, but they never dare to say whether this should happen sooner or later. They express a preference for accepting even a painful death if they must go to God, rather than continuing to live a pleasant life away from Him (237/25 – 30).

Immediately afterwards Hythlodaeus launches into a passionate eulogy of Utopia which is judged "not merely the best but the only one which can rightly claim the name of a commonwealth" (237/39). Everywhere men talk about public good but always look after their private interests. Only in Utopia "where nothing is private" and "everything belongs to everybody", people seriously engage themselves with public affairs (239/2 – 3). This becomes possible because "though no man has anything, yet all are rich" (239/13 – 14); people are joyful and free of all worries. Although Utopia is a pagan society, in the finale Hythlodaeus describes its outstanding achievements using a term that Christians would fully appreciate. Thanks to their education, institutions and customs, the Utopians were able to destroy "that one single monster, the chief and progenitor of all the plagues" – pride (243/29 – 32).

Thomas More obviously follows St. Augustine who considered pride the mother of all sin and the biggest obstacle to personal salvation[7]; but unlike him, he regards pride primarily as the main cause of social evil and the greatest threat to the common good. This is the explanation why More ignores the understanding of pride as internal characteristic of the corrupted soul of a sinner and describes it predominantly in material and especially economic terms. This unusual interpretation becomes obvious from the only two places in Book II where pride is described. In the beginning, we are told that pride "counts it a personal glory to excel others by superfluous display of possessions" (139/8 – 9); in the peroration at the very end of Hythlodaeus' monologue, we get an eloquent expanded definition: "[P]ride measures prosperity not by her own advantages but by others' disadvantages. Pride would not consent to be made even a goddess if no poor wretches were left for her to domineer over and scoff at, if her good fortune might not dazzle by comparison with their miseries, if the display of her riches did not torment and intensify their poverty" (243/33 – 38). Hythlodaeus' final words show the inextricable link between the public good as the ultimate goal, pride as the main obstacle to its achievement, and common property as the most successful instrument for defeating pride. We have to recognise that if understood as a socio-economic threat pride could be subjugated through a network of political and economic institutions that will change completely the social relations. In this context, the most important transformative institution is common property. Although Morus is sceptical about it, we have every reason to assert that on this point Hythlodaeus and More are in complete agreement.

Pride, reason and salvation

Hythlodaeus considers Utopians' institutions so admirable and solid that he is certain the foundations of their state will last forever (245/8). In addition to this bold prediction of longevity, his conviction contains also the assertion that Utopia needs no refinement or improvement. It can and should remain static for as long as reason dominates and property is common, there will be peace and prosperity for all. At no point during Hythlodaeus' long monologue does More allow Morus to intervene with gestures or words. At the very end Morus is allowed to think (not speak) about some serious objections but rather decides to deliberately hold back so as not to offend his guest. The book ends without a definitive discussion, critique or evaluation of what has been narrated. Formally, no lessons and conclusions are drawn for the readers. Essentially, the discussion and evaluation of the institutions and customs of the Utopians is laid out before us. The strange thing is that More accomplishes all this not through Morus, but through the words of Hythlodaeus himself. The reader is given many opportunities to react, judge and criticize. More gives us abundant evidence that, despite their rationality, neither the Utopians are infallible nor all their institutions and practices are worthy of emulation.

A close reading reveals the existence of a shifting balance of ***eu***topian and ***dys***topian elements between the three parts. After the entirely positive first part More seems to distance himself from the imaginary island he has created by repeatedly referring to the Utopians with an irony that grows into outright satire. The reversal is gradual and mixed with positive elements but a careful reader cannot fail to trace the changes of tone and sympathies. The rational defence and encouragement of euthanasia are repugnant not only from a late medieval Christian perspective but to almost all Christians today. There can be no doubt that the custom demanding the future newlyweds to inspect their naked bodies to avoid unpleasant surprises at a later stage is highly objectionable (187 – 189). There is no doubt that slavery is also utterly unacceptable. In Utopia, it is not hereditary, is significantly better than medieval serfdom, and is much milder and more humane than classical slavery. It is slavery nevertheless and the fact that it is simply taken for granted without any explanation is especially offensive (139;141;185).

Equally repulsive is the rational justification of colonialism, according to which Utopians seem to award themselves a natural right to seize territory and impose their laws on those peoples who, in their judgment, are just not industrious enough to cultivate all their lands (137/7 – 21). Without any exaggeration we can say that the long chapter "Military affairs" (199 – 217) could easily have been part of the notorious work *Il Principe* of Niccollo Machiavelli[8]; its startling content expressed in a calm neutral style is worthy of the pen of the great Florentine. Bribery, treachery, encouragement of treason and sedition, hiring of assassins, presence of soldiers' families (including women and children) on the battlefield, employing mercenaries with utter disregard for their lives – all this shows that Utopians have no moral inhibitions and stop at nothing in the pursuit of victory.

The Utopians may have forever banished pride understood as a socio-economic threat thanks to their laws and institutions, but they have in no way overcome human sinfulness. They are rational, educated, hardworking and public spirited indeed; at the same time, they are filled with pride understood as self-righteousness and as unbridled sense of one's own superiority. They are deprived of consciousness of their own *superbia*. Utopians can be arrogant, aggressive and ruthless to both individual human beings and entire peoples – and never feel any remorse. Had More concluded at this point (217/7), Utopia could be seen as a dystopia, as yet another triumph of St. Augustine's grim view on human nature.

The last third part brings hope back. Here we see direct conflict between the rational ethical principles of the Utopians and their religious beliefs. Slaves are forced to do the most degrading work and yet there are free individuals who voluntarily take on the hardest tasks. Although generally adhering to a moderate hedonism, some give up bodily pleasures and burden themselves with deprivation and exhausting labour (225 – 227). Euthanasia is accepted and even encouraged if it ends a life that has become permanent torture; however, people are willing to endure any suffering if they believe that it brings them closer to God (237). All these examples demonstrate that religious beliefs modify and mitigate the purely rational consequences of the rules of conduct that Utopians have constructed for themselves.

Conclusion

After experiencing a range of emotions - from admiration and wonder to confusion and disgust - the reader is ultimately left with a sense of hope. It springs from two sources. First, religious motivation is given precedence in most cases concerning morality even if reason dictates the opposite. Second, the religious experience of the Utopians is an evolutionary process. It develops through a gradual movement from pagan superstition and polytheism towards a rational monotheism, combined with the belief in the immortality of the soul (217). As if Providence had guided them in inscrutable ways to come as close to Christianity as it is possible without having heard of the Saviour. No wonder when the teaching of Christ is shared with them, they embrace it with joy (217/35 – 38). For centuries, without being aware, they have been preparing their souls for it.

Utopia is neither perfect nor static. The Utopians did everything that is humanly possible to organise their commonwealth in harmony with the dictates of reason; unfortunately, this is not enough to avoid sin. The wisdom of the Book of Natural Reason they were following will be humbled and elevated by the revelation of the Book of Holy Scripture. Utopia may become eutopia thanks to the saving power of Christianity. The best human society, therefore, will be a fellowship of men who have combined reason as the foundation of their politics and economy with Christian revelation.

Acknowledgement

This study is financed by the European Union-NextGenerationEU, through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria, project No BG-RRP-2.004-0008.

NOTES

1. Thomas More is mentioned several times in *Das Kapital* but the famous reference to arbitrary land enclosure which inspired generations of Marxist scholars is in Book I, chapter 28 (Marx 1974, p. 687).
2. On the obelisk, the names of nineteen "outstanding thinkers and personalities of the struggle for the liberation of workers" were inscribed. Marx and Engels were first and second, Thomas More was ninth in the company of Tommaso Campanella, Alexander Bakunin and others. The obelisk was erected in 1914 as a celebration of the tercentenary of the House of Romanov.
3. Pope Pius XI honoured More as the greatest martyr of the English Reformation and Pope John Paul II in 2000 declared More the patron saint of politicians (Cziganyik 2023, p. 425).
4. In the text of the present article, all quotations from *Utopia* will hereafter refer to this edition and will be made by page and line only: e.g., 49/20 – 40 means page 49, lines 20 – 40. "Morus" will be used for More-the-character in the book *Utopia* while "More" for More-the-author of the book.
5. All three earliest translations (German (1524), Italian (1548) and French (1550)) entirely omitted Book I (Davis 2011, p. 30).
6. The original Latin phrase is *hunc parentem uocant*, i.e, "parent" instead of "father" (216/15).
7. More had lectured publicly as a youth on *De civitate Dei* (Erasmus 1918, p. 96).
8. The treatise was written several years before *Utopia* between 1511 and 1513 but was published in 1532, five years after the death of Machiavelli.

REFERENCES

CZIGANYIK, Z. 2024. Utopia in East Central Europe. In: Shrank, Cathy and Withington, Phil. *The Oxford Handbook of Thomas More's* Utopia*,* Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780198881018.

DAVIS, J. C., 2011. Thomas More's *Utopia*: sources, legacy, interpretation. In: LOGAN, G. (editor). *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas More,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-88862-2.

ERASMUS, D., 1918. *Epistles of Erasmus,* vol. 3, London: Longmans, Green and Co.

KAUTSKY, K. 1888. *Thomas More und seine Utopie***,** Stuttgart: J.H.W. Dietz Verlag.

KRISTELLER, Paul. 1980. Thomas More as a Renaissance Humanist, *Moreana,* vol. 17, no. 1 – 2, pp. 5 – 22. ISSN 0047-8105.

LESLIE, M. 1998. *Renaissance Utopias and the Problem of History*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, ISBN 0-8014-3400-9.

LOGAN, G. 2014. *The Meaning of Thomas More's Utopia*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983, ISBN 9781400855872.

LEWIS, C. S., 1977. Thomas More. In: SYLVESTER, R. & MARC'HADOUR, G.P. (Eds). *Essential Articles for the Study of Thomas More*, Connecticut: Archon Books. ISBN 13-978-0208015549.

MARIUS, R., 1984. *Thomas More: A Biography,* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. ISBN 0-674-88525-2

Marx, K., 1974. *Capital*, vol. 1, Moscow: Progress Publishers. ISBN 10101-455-1-75.

MORE, TH., 1965. Utopia. In: SURTZ, E. & HEXTER, J.H. (Eds), *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. 4. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. ISBN 0-300-00982-8

SHRANK, C., & WITHINGTON, P., 2024. Introduction to Thomas More's *Utopia*, In: SHRANK, C. & WITHINGTON, P. *The Oxford Handbook of Thomas More's* Utopia*,* Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780198881018

SKINNER, Q., 1997. Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* and the Language of Renaissance Humanism. In: PAGDEN, A. (Ed.). *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe, Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press, pp. 123 – 158. ISBN 0-521-3207-9

✉ **Prof. Svetoslav Malinov**
Sofia University
E-mail: smalinov@phls.uni-sofia.bg