

剑桥政治思想史原著系列（影印本）

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

利 维 坦

Leviathan

Hobbes

霍布斯

Edited by

RICHARD TUCK

中国政法大学出版社

托马斯·霍布斯
THOMAS HOBBES

利 维 坦
Leviathan

REVISED STUDENT EDITION

EDITED BY

RICHARD TUCK

Professor of Government, Harvard University

中国政法大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

利维坦/(英)霍布斯著.—北京:中国政法大学出版社,2003.5

剑桥政治思想史原著系列(影印本)

ISBN 7-5620-2392-1

I. 利... II. 霍... III. 立宪君主制—国家理论—英国—近代—英文 IV. D033

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2003)第 052749 号

* * * * *

书 名	《利维坦》
出 版 人	李传敢
经 销	全国各地新华书店
出版发行	中国政法大学出版社
承 印	清华大学印刷厂
开 本	880 × 1230mm 1/32
印 张	19.5
版 本	2003 年 7 月第 1 版 2003 年 7 月第 1 次印刷
书 号	ISBN 7-5620-2392-1/D·2352
印 数	0 001-2 000
定 价	43.00 元
社 址	北京市海淀区西土城路 25 号 邮政编码 100088
电 话	(010)62229563 (010)62229278 (010)62229803
电子信箱	zfs620@263.net
网 址	http://www.cupl.edu.cn/cbs/index.htm

声 明

1. 版权所有,侵权必究。
2. 如发现缺页、倒装问题,请与出版社联系调换。

原书由剑桥大学出版社于 1991 年出版,此影印本的出版获得剑桥大学出版社财团(英国剑桥)的许可。

© *in the introduction and editorial matter*
Cambridge University Press 1991, 1996

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

剑桥政治思想史原著系列

丛书编辑

Raymond Geuss

剑桥大学哲学高级讲师

Quentin Skinner

剑桥大学近代史讲座教授

在政治理论领域，“剑桥政治思想史原著系列”作为主要的学生教科丛书，如今已牢固确立了其地位。本丛书旨在使学生能够获得从古希腊到 20 世纪初期西方政治思想史方面所有最为重要的原著。它囊括了所有著名的经典原著，但与此同时，它又扩展了传统的评价尺度，以便能够纳入范围广泛、不那么出名的作品。而在此之前，这些作品中有许多从未有过现代英文版本可资利用。只要可能，所选原著都会以完整而不删节的形式出版，其中的译作则是专门为本丛书的目的而安排。每一本书都有一个评论性的导言，加上历史年表、生平梗概、进一步阅读指南，以及必要的词汇表和原文注解。本丛书的最终目的是，为西方政治思想的整个发展脉络提供一个清晰的轮廓。

本丛书已出版著作的书目，请查阅书末。

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Series editors

RAYMOND GEUSS

Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Cambridge

QUENTIN SKINNER

Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge

Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought is now firmly established as the major student textbook series in political theory. It aims to make available to students all the most important texts in the history of western political thought, from ancient Greece to the early twentieth century. All the familiar classic texts will be included, but the series seeks at the same time to enlarge the conventional canon by incorporating an extensive range of less well-known works, many of them never before available in a modern English edition. Wherever possible, texts are published in complete and unabridged form, and translations are specially commissioned for the series. Each volume contains a critical introduction together with chronologies, biographical sketches, a guide to further reading and any necessary glossaries and textual apparatus. When completed the series will aim to offer an outline of the entire evolution of western political thought.

For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book

Acknowledgements

As I explain in the note on the text, this edition is drawn from two sources: one is a special copy of *Leviathan* in the Cambridge University Library (where it is part of the Royal Library acquired from John Moore, the Bishop of Ely, and given to the University by George I in 1715), and the other is the manuscript of *Leviathan* in the British Library. I would like to thank the librarians in both institutions for their help and for giving permission to reproduce material in their charge; I owe a particular debt to Brian Jenkins, Under-Librarian in charge of the Rare Books Room at the University Library. I would also like to thank David McKitterick, Librarian of Trinity College, for help and advice about Moore's library; Peter Jones, Librarian of King's College, for letting me consult the college's remarkable collection of Hobbes's works (bequeathed to them by Lord Keynes) and for helping me in other ways; and Peter Day, Keeper of the Works of Art at Chatsworth, who helped to uncover the curious fact that there was apparently no copy of *Leviathan* at Hardwick or Chatsworth until the nineteenth century. Other scholars have given me a great deal of advice, especially Noel Malcolm, Quentin Skinner, Maurice Goldsmith, Ian Harris (see p. lxxv) and Lucien Jaume.

Introduction

I

Hobbes's *Leviathan* has always aroused strong feelings in its readers. Nowadays, it is generally reckoned to be the masterpiece of English political thought, and a work which more than any other defined the character of modern politics; from the late seventeenth century to the early twentieth century, all great writers on political theory have measured themselves against it. But when it first appeared in the bookshops of England, in late April or early May 1651,¹ it seemed to many of its readers to be deeply shocking and offensive, both in its unsentimental account of political power and in its extraordinarily heterodox vision of the role of religion in human society. Even people who had formerly admired Hobbes and his philosophical writings were affronted by the book; one of Hobbes's old acquaintances, the Anglican theologian Henry Hammond, described it later that same year as 'a farrago of Christian Atheism', a description which (as we shall see) was close to the mark.²

These old friends were particularly angered by the book because it seemed to them to be an act of treachery. They had known

¹ See the letter from Robert Payne to Gilbert Sheldon, 6 May 1651: 'I am advertised from Ox. that Mr Hobbes's book is printed and come thither: he calls it *Leviathan*. Much of his *de Cive* is translated into it: he seems to favour the present Government, and commends his book to be read in the Universities, despite all censures that may pass upon it. It is folio at 8s.6d. price, but I have not yet seen it.' [Anon], 'Illustrations of the State of the Church during the Great Rebellion', *The Theologian and Ecclesiastic* 6 (1848) p. 223.

² [Anon], 'Illustrations of the State of the Church during the Great Rebellion', *The Theologian and Ecclesiastic* 9 (1850) pp. 294-5.

Hobbes as an enthusiastic supporter of the royalist cause in the English Civil War between King and Parliament; indeed, he had been in exile at Paris since 1640 because of his adherence to that cause, and *Leviathan* was written in France. When the book appeared, however, it seemed to justify submission to the new republic introduced after the King's execution in January 1649, and the abandonment of the Church of England for which many of the royalists had fought. His friends' shock at this *volte face* coloured contemporary reactions to Hobbes, and has affected his reputation down to our own times; though they may have misinterpreted some of Hobbes's intentions in writing *Leviathan*.

The first task in assessing what those intentions were, and a basic question to raise about any text, is to ask when the book was written. Our first information about the composition of the work which later became *Leviathan* comes in a letter of May 1650. In it, one of these old royalist friends wrote to Hobbes with a request that he translate into English one of his earlier Latin works on politics, so that it could have an influence on the current English political scene. Hobbes apparently replied that 'he hath another trifle on hand, which is *Politique* in English, of which he hath finished thirty-seven chapters (intending about fifty in the whole,) which are translated into French by a learned Frenchman of good quality, as fast as he finishes them'. This 'trifle' was to be *Leviathan*, and when his friend learned what it contained he wrote 'again and again' to Hobbes pleading with him to moderate his views, though with no success.³ *Leviathan* has forty-seven chapters rather than fifty, but Hobbes's programme of May 1650 was obviously fulfilled, though a French translation never appeared, and may not have been completed.

The fact that Hobbes wanted one tells us, incidentally, that he believed the book to be as relevant to the contemporary French political disturbances as to those of England. The years 1649–52 were the years when the 'Fronde', the confused uprising against the absolutist government of France, was at its height, and Paris itself had been seized by the rebels early in 1649: not only Englishmen needed instruction in the duties of subjects. We do not know how long Hobbes had taken to write the thirty-seven chapters which

³ [Anon], 'Illustrations of the State of the Church during the Great Rebellion', *The Theologian and Ecclesiastic* 6 (1848) pp. 172–3.

he had finished by May 1650 (approximately 60% of the total work), but if he wrote them at the same speed as the last ten chapters he would have started to compose the book at the beginning of 1649 – interestingly, at the time at which King Charles I was being tried for his life.

It is true that there are a number of passages in *Leviathan* which speak of the Civil War as still in progress (notably one on p. 311), and that only right at the end (in a famous passage on the new ecclesiastical regime in England in the last chapter, and in the Review and Conclusion) does Hobbes talk as if there is a settled government in England once again. Since the Civil War is conventionally thought to have ended by 1649, it might be deduced that Hobbes must have written much of the book well before the execution. Similar passages in the Latin *Leviathan* of 1668 (see below), which are not always straightforward translations of the English text, have sometimes even been taken to imply that the Latin version is based on an earlier draft than the English version, though there is no good reason for thinking this.⁴

But we tend to forget that the execution of the King and the declaration of a republic in England were not seen by contemporaries as the end of the war, for there remained a strong army in Scotland which was opposed to the actions of the republicans in England. That army was conclusively defeated by Cromwell at Dunbar in September 1650, and the great historian of the Civil War Edward, Earl of Clarendon (himself a royalist) recorded that it was this victory which 'was looked upon, in all places, as the entire conquest of the whole kingdom'.⁵ Though the royalists were still able to mount a resistance based in Scotland, which began in the spring of 1651 and ended ignominiously at the Battle of Worcester in September 1651, *Leviathan* was obviously completed in the political climate following Dunbar, when the war at last seemed to be over. It was at this time, in particular, that Hobbes penned the Review and Conclusion with its explicit call for submission to the

⁴ For example, the Latin text at one point speaks of 'the war which is now being waged in England', whereas the English version has 'the late troubles' (p. 170). (*Leviathan*, trans. and ed. F. Tricaud (Paris 1971) pp. xxv–xxvi). But 'late' in seventeenth-century English does not necessarily mean 'now completed'; it can also mean 'recent'.

⁵ Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, ... also his Life*. . . (Oxford 1843) p. 752.

new regime. The bulk of it had however been written during a time when the ultimate victor was not so clear, and when a Scottish army devoted to the King might still have enforced its wishes upon the two kingdoms. So when reading *Leviathan* we have to bear in mind Hobbes's uncertainty about the result of the civil wars in both England and France, and his hope that the arguments in the book might have some effect upon the outcome; in particular, we have to remember that Hobbes wrote it while still attending the court of the exiled King Charles II, and that he probably originally intended the King to be the dedicatee of the book (see the Note on the Text). It was in part a contribution to an argument among the exiles.⁶

II

The next question to ask is, what kind of life, both intellectual and practical, had Hobbes led by 1649?⁷ He was already a thinker of some note, though less notoriety; indeed, many men of his time would have already ended their writing career at his age, for he was 61 in April 1649. He had survived a serious illness two years earlier which came close to killing him, but he had another thirty years to live – he died in December 1679. He had been born in Armada year, 1588, into a relatively poor family in Malmesbury (Wiltshire). His father was a low-grade clergyman (probably not even a university graduate) who became an alcoholic and then abandoned his family; Hobbes's education at the grammar school in Malmesbury and subsequently at a hall in Oxford (that is, a cheaper and less prestigious version of a college) was paid for by his uncle. Hobbes was clearly recognised as an extremely bright pupil, particularly at the central skill of the Renaissance curriculum, the study of languages. His facility at languages remained with him all his life, and he spent much time on the practice of translation: the first work published under his name (in 1629) was a translation of Thucydides, and one of the last (in 1674) was a translation of Homer. He

⁶ While the first edition of the Cambridge *Leviathan* was in the press, Dr Glenn Burgess came independently to the same view, and has given a range of arguments in its favour. See his 'Contexts for the Writing and Publication of Hobbes's *Leviathan*', *History of Political Thought* 11 (1990) pp. 675–702.

⁷ What follows is largely based on my *Hobbes* (Oxford 1989) and *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge 1993).

was a fluent writer in Latin as well as English, and could also read Italian, French and Greek. These skills were allied to a sophistication of style, represented by his capacity to write poetry in two languages as well as elegant prose. As with all Renaissance writers, his education was first and foremost a *literary* one.

Men with these skills were sought after in Renaissance Europe, for they could provide important assistance to anyone involved in public life. They could draft letters and speeches, reply to foreign correspondents, educate the older children of a household in the techniques of public life, and generally act rather like aides to modern Senators in the United States. This was indeed to be Hobbes's career throughout his life, for on graduating from Oxford in 1608 he was recommended to the post of secretary and tutor in the household of William Cavendish, soon to be the first Earl of Devonshire and one of the richest men in England. Thenceforward Hobbes (when in England) lived in the houses of the Earl, at Hardwick Hall in Derbyshire or Devonshire House in London, and he died at Hardwick still an honoured servant of the family, or 'domestic' as he once termed himself. He was not always employed directly by the Earls of Devonshire, for at various times there was no person in that family who was playing a part in public life; but at such times he would work for their neighbours in Derbyshire, and in particular for their cousins the Earls of Newcastle who lived at Welbeck. One of his duties was taking the heirs to the Earldoms on a Grand Tour of Europe, and between 1610 and 1640 he spent four years on the Continent. Because he was travelling with a young man of great social standing, he had access with his master to the most important political and intellectual figures of Europe, meeting (for example) the leaders of Venice in their struggle with the Papacy, Cardinals at Rome, senior figures in Geneva, and Galileo. His practical and personal knowledge of European politics was unrivalled by any English thinker of his generation (and arguably by only one on the Continent, the Dutchman Hugo Grotius).

Although careers of this kind (though not quite as international in character) would not have been uncommon anywhere in Western Europe since the beginnings of the Renaissance, the particular intellectual concerns which Hobbes seems to have had most at heart would have seemed unfamiliar to the men of the early Renaissance. In the eyes of the first humanists, the point of an education in the

classics (particularly the Roman writers) was to equip a man for the kind of public service which their heroes such as Cicero had performed: the best way of life (they believed) was that of the active and engaged citizen, fighting for the liberty of his *respublica* or using his oratorical skills to persuade his fellow citizens to fight with him. 'Liberty' meant for them freedom both from external oppression by a foreign power, and from internal domination by a Caesar or any other figure who would reduce the republican citizens to mere subjects. Even Machiavelli, often associated by later ages with the techniques of princely domination, extolled these values in his *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Livy*, while *The Prince* itself does not completely eschew them; it contains, for example, notable pleas for the ruler to rely on the mass of the people, who will never let him down,⁸ and to govern through a citizen army, the central institution of Renaissance republicanism.

But by the end of the sixteenth century, many European intellectuals had turned away from these values, though they retained a commitment to understanding their own time in terms of the ideas of antiquity, and a hostility to the kind of scholastic theories which had preceded the Renaissance. In place of Cicero, they read (and wrote like) Tacitus, the historian of the early Roman Empire; and in Tacitus' writings they found an account of politics as the domain of corruption and treachery, in which princes manipulated unstable and dangerous populations, and wise men either retreated from the public domain or were destroyed by it. Tacitus described in detail the techniques of manipulation which (he implied) all princes will use, and his Renaissance readers were equally fascinated by them; the study and analysis of these techniques gave rise to the remarkable literature of works on 'reason of state' which flooded the bookshops of Europe between 1590 and 1630. As the sixteenth century drew to its close, after decades of civil and religious war, and the corresponding construction of powerful monarchies to render the threat from civil war harmless, this political literature made extremely good sense of contemporary life.

Alongside this literature, and intersecting with it in various interesting ways, was another one, in which the themes of ancient Stoicism and Scepticism were explored in tandem. The advice of the

⁸ See *The Prince*, ed. Quentin Skinner and Russell Price (Cambridge 1988) p. 37.

Stoic philosophers who were Tacitus' contemporaries had indeed been that the wise man should retreat from the forum and avoid emotionally committing himself to any principles which would lead him to hazard himself in the political struggle, and we find this advice reiterated by late sixteenth-century writers such as Justus Lipsius in the Netherlands and Michel de Montaigne in France, in the context (often) of an explicitly Tacitist account of politics. But it had seemed to many ancient authors who had debated these issues that mere emotional detachment was not enough: as the sceptics, the followers of Pyrrho and Carneades, urged, it was impossible to be fully detached if one continued to believe that the moral or political principles in question were *true*.⁹ So the sceptics argued that the wise man would protect himself best by renouncing not just emotion, but also *belief*; reflection, particularly on the multiplicity of conflicting beliefs and practices to be found in the world, would quickly persuade him that his beliefs were indeed insufficiently founded. Since, in antiquity, ideas about the natural world were intimately bound up with ideas about human action and morality – for example, the Stoics believed that men were enmeshed in a world of deterministic physical causation, and could therefore not freely alter their situation – the sceptics also wanted to free the wise man from the burden of commitment to scientific theories. So they argued that all existing physical sciences were incoherent, and could not take account of such things as the prevalence of optical illusions; even pure mathematics were vitiated by (for example) the notorious difficulties involved in making sense of Euclid's fundamental definitions (a line without breadth, etc). Lipsius and Montaigne both sympathised with this extension of the original Stoic programme, and Montaigne in particular became famous for the richness and force of his sceptical arguments.¹⁰

Hobbes's duties in the Cavendish household included studying this new literature, and showing his pupils how to contribute to it. They were all particularly interested in the work of their contem-

⁹ Pyrrho was the fourth-century BC founder of the Sceptical school; Carneades lived 150 years later, and developed the Sceptical tradition under the aegis of the 'New Academy' – whence his version of scepticism is conventionally termed 'Academic' as distinct from 'Pyrrhonian' Scepticism.

¹⁰ For an account of this movement, see my *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge 1993) pp. 31–64.

porary, an old friend of the Cavendish family, Sir Francis Bacon; in the 1650s it was still known that Hobbes highly regarded Bacon's works, and that he had even for a time acted as Bacon's amanuensis (he was probably loaned to Bacon by the Earl of Devonshire shortly before 1620).¹¹ Bacon was one of the first and most important figures in England to import this new kind of humanism: he wrote history in a Tacitist style himself, and also published the first volume of 'essays' to appear in English, modelled on the *essais* of Montaigne. But there was a degree of ambiguity in Bacon's approach, which in many ways remained a feature of Hobbes's outlook also. Bacon certainly believed that politics was in general an arena of princely manipulation, and that the sceptics were right to stress the inadequacy of conventional science; moreover, like the other philosophers in this *genre*, he believed in the necessity of psychological self-manipulation in order to fit oneself mentally for the modern world.¹² But he also still believed, like an early Renaissance man, that individual citizens ought to engage in public life, and that they should psychologically prepare themselves to do so. Moreover, Bacon argued (conspicuously against Montaigne) that the pursuit of the sciences was useful for active citizens, if the sciences could be properly put on a new foundation.

Hobbes was of course educating young men who were destined for political office, and he and his pupils seem to have found Bacon's blend of Tacitism and civic engagement rather appealing: together they wrote imitations of Bacon's essays and discourses, and Hobbes himself (it has recently been convincingly argued) composed his first long treatment of politics in the form of a discourse on the first four paragraphs of Tacitus' *Annals*, in which Tacitus gave a succinct account of the career of the Emperor Augustus.¹³ It was

¹¹ For Hobbes's opinion of Bacon, see the letter to Hobbes from Du Verdus, August 1654, in Hobbes, *Correspondence* ed. Noel Malcolm (Oxford 1994) pp. 194, 196. For his association with Bacon, see *ibid.* pp. 628–9.

¹² See for example his long discussion of the appropriate techniques in his *The Advancement of Learning*, *Of the proficience and advancement of learning, divine and humane* (London 1605); *Works*, ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis and Douglas Deron Heath V (London 1858) pp. 23–30.

¹³ The technical statistical evidence for Hobbes's authorship of this discourse, together with a shorter piece, 'Of Lawes', and an interesting guide to contemporary Rome, is to be found in N.B. Reynolds and J.L. Hilton, 'Thomas Hobbes and Authorship of the *Horae Subsecivae*', *History of Political Thought* 14 (1993) pp. 361–80. The internal textual evidence, some of which I cite below, seems to me equally convincing, at least as far as the discourses on Tacitus and Rome go.

published together with some of his pupil's essays in an anonymous volume of 1620, by a publisher wanting to cash in on the craze for Baconian essays,¹⁴ and it contains many themes familiar from *Leviathan*. These include the remark that a 'Popular state . . . is to the Provinces not as one, but many tyrants'¹⁵ (compare *Leviathan* p. 135) and the observation that all men are 'of this condition, that desire and hope of good more affecteth them than fruition: for this induceth satiety; but hope is a whetstone to mens desires, and will not suffer them to languish'¹⁶ (*Leviathan* p. 46). It also reveals one of the roots of Hobbes's life-long concern with the idea of liberty; the first sentence of the *Annals* reads: 'In the beginning, kings ruled the city of Rome. Lucius Brutus founded freedom, and the consulate',¹⁷ and it was often used in the Tacitist tradition as a peg upon which to hang a discussion of the true meaning of liberty. In his discourse, Hobbes remarked that Brutus had not really been justified in overthrowing the Roman monarchy, but that Tarquin's private crimes

gave colour to his expulsion, & to the alteration of government. And this is by the author entitled, Liberty, not because bondage is always ioyned to Monarchy; but where Kings abuse their places, tyrannize over their Subiects [etc] . . . such usurpation over mens estates, and natures, many times breakes forth into attempts for liberty, and is hardly endured by mans nature, and passion, though reason and Religion teach us to beare the yoke. So that, it is not the government, but the abuse that makes the alteration be termed Liberty.¹⁸

Augustus, on the other hand, is praised throughout the discourse for his skill in manipulating his citizens, and in particular for con-

¹⁴ The volume is entitled *Horae Subsecivae, Observations and Discourses* (London 1620). A full discussion of its complicated genesis is to be found in Noel Malcolm, 'Hobbes, Sandys and the Virginia Company', *Historical Journal* 24 (1981) pp. 297–321. The Hobbesian discourses are shortly to be published in a separate volume by Chicago University Press.

¹⁵ *Horae Subsecivae* p. 269.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 291. Another example would be the fierce attack on ever buying-off political opponents – 'to heape benefits on the sullen, and averse, out of hope to win their affection, is unjust and prejudiciall' (*Horae Subsecivae* p. 266, compare *Leviathan* pp. 241–2).

¹⁷ *Urbem Romam a principio reges habuere. Libertatem, & Consulatam L. Brutus instituit.*

¹⁸ *Horae subsecivae* pp. 228–9. The term 'colour', incidentally, was a technical term of rhetoric much favoured by both Bacon and Hobbes.

cealing the true character of his rule.¹⁹ And yet a certain nostalgia for the republic continually surfaces in the discourse, as it did in Tacitus himself: Hobbes agreed with contemporary Tacitists that free republics had to fall at the hands of manipulative princes, particularly (as he said p. 239) after a period of civil war, but he described the supercession of the old republican manners with some regret. The citizens

now studie no more the Art of commanding, which had beene heretofore necessarie for any *Romane* Gentleman, when the rule of the whole might come to all of them in their turnes; but apply themselves wholly to the Arts of service, whereof *obsequiousnesse* is the chiefe, and is so long to bee accounted laudable, as it may bee distinguished from Flatterie, and profitable, whilst it turne not into tediousnesse.²⁰

Hobbes followed up this discourse with the first work published under his name, a translation of the Greek historian Thucydides (1629), in which there is a somewhat similar ambivalence. Thucydides too depicted the fall of a republic, in terms remarkably similar to those Tacitus was to use, but at the same time put into the mouths of some of his characters a noble defence of republican and democratic values. Thucydides also argued that the true cause of the Peloponnesian war was the fear which the Spartans felt at the sheer growth in Athenian power; in a marginal note, Hobbes emphasised this point, something to which Bacon too had drawn attention while urging the English government to break its treaties and make war on Spain. The idea that fear in itself justified aggression was already a commonplace in the circles within which Hobbes moved.²¹

Eight years later Hobbes also published (anonymously) a radically altered version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in which the interest which

¹⁹ E.g. 'it is not wisdom for one that is to convert a *free State* into a *Monarchy*, to take away all the shew of their libertie at one blowe, and on a suddaine make them feeble servitude, without first introducing into their mindes some *previae dispositiones*, or preparatives whereby they may the better endure it' (p. 261).

²⁰ *Horae Subsecivae* p. 307.

²¹ For his translation of Thucydides, see *Hobbes's Thucydides*, ed. Richard Schlatter (New Brunswick NJ 1975). The passage referred to is p. 42, and Hobbes's note is p. 577. Bacon's use of Thucydides is in *Considerations Touching a War with Spain* which he drafted for Prince Charles in 1624 as part of his campaign to reopen the war with Spain. *Works* ed. James Spedding *et al.*, xiv (London 1874) p. 474.