Lincoln College
Summer reading 2026

Please find below your preparatory reading assignments for the Introduction to Law course, which will take place in Michaelmas Term.

It will be most helpful for you if you complete these readings first, *before* starting your assignments for the other subjects.

General Introduction

Please read the chapters listed below from *Letters to a Law Student* by Nicholas McBride (Pearson, 5th edn 2022).

This refers to the most recent fifth edition of the book, but earlier ones are also fine – just remember that they may not take account of more recent legal developments e.g. Brexit. The book is widely available to buy in large bookshops and online, but if you cannot get hold of a copy you will be able to access the book through the library in Oxford once you arrive.

Reading:

- Chapter 1 'What is law'
- Chapter 8 'How (and how not) to argue'
- Chapter 9 'General Tips on Studying Law'
- Chapter 13 'Making the most of your time'
- Chapter 14 'Using a textbook'
- Chapter 15 'Reading cases'
- Chapter 17 'Making sense of statutes'
- Chapter 18 'How to get through an article'
- Chapter 23 'How to write an essay'

A Case to Consider

Please read the UK Supreme Court's 2019 judgment in *R (on the application of Miller) v The Prime Minister* [2019] UKSC 41 and answer the questions below and overleaf. A pdf of the judgment is attached to this email.

Before you begin reading the case, you may wish to watch this **short video** of Lady Hale reading a summary of the judgment: https://www.supremecourt.uk/watch/uksc-2019-0192/judgment.html

Everything you need to answer the questions can be found in the judgment. Your answers do not need to be lengthy provided they answer the question, but please ensure you include a reference to the paragraph(s) of the judgment on which you base your answer.

Questions:

1. Who are the parties to the case?
2. What were the previous procedural steps before the case reached the Supreme Court? Which other courts heard the case before it reached the Supreme Court?
3. What are the facts of the case?
4. What were the legal arguments made by each party?
5. Why does the judgment distinguish between issues concerning 'the lawfulness of the exercise of a prerogative power within its lawful limits' and issues 'concerning the lawful limits of the power and whether they have been exceeded'? (paragraph 36) Which kind of issue does the Court conclude was involved in this case?
6. Which 'constitutional principles' does the Court refer to in its judgment?
7. How would you describe, in your own words, the key legal problem/question that the Court had to decide in this case?
8. What solution/answer did the Court reach and why? What reasons did it give?
9. What remedy (if any) did the Court award? Why?
10. Were all the judges in agreement as to the outcome? Were there any dissenting opinions?
11. Do you agree or disagree with (all or part of) the judgment? Why?
12. What do you think is the strongest argument *in favour* of the Supreme Court's conclusion in the case?
13. What do you think is the strongest argument you could make *against* the Supreme Court's conclusion?

Andreas Vassiliou