I

Introduction: Hobbes's life in philosophy

I

With this third and concluding volume, I turn from Renaissance theories of self-government to their leading philosophical opponent, Thomas Hobbes. As we shall see, Hobbes was nurtured in the humanist ideals with which I was chiefly concerned in volume 2. But he went on to repudiate his upbringing and, in developing his theories of freedom, obligation and the state, he sought to discredit and supersede some of the most fundamental tenets of humanist political thought. Reacting above all against the Renaissance predilection for self-governing city-republics, he constructed a theory of absolute sovereignty grounded on a covenant specifically requiring that each one of us 'give up my Right of Governing my selfe'.[1] The aim of this Introduction will be to trace the process by which Hobbes arrived at these anti-humanist commitments, to examine the resulting elements in his civil science and to consider their place in his more general scheme of the sciences.

II

To begin at the beginning. Thomas Hobbes was born on 5 April 1588 in Westport, a parish adjoining the town of Malmesbury in Wiltshire.[2] He was the second son of another Thomas Hobbes,[3] curate of the neighbouring and all too aptly named parish of Brokenborough.[4] The elder Hobbes appears to have found his life altogether too much for him. A

[1] Hobbes 1996, ch. 17, p. 120. [2] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, pp. 323, 327.

[3] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, pp. 323 and 324–5 notes that Edmund, brother of Hobbes *père*, was his elder by two years.

[4] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 323 wrongly describes Hobbes's father as vicar of Westport. Malcolm 1996, pp. 14, 38 corrects the mistake. Malcolm also notes (p. 14) that Brokenborough was one of the poorest livings in the area. Malcolm's article is of exceptional value and I am greatly indebted to it.

man of little education who could barely read the church services,[5] he played cards all night, fell asleep during the sermon,[6] became notorious for drunken and quarrelsome behaviour[7] and eventually fled to London in 1604 after picking a fight with another local clergyman.[8] It is not known whether his famous son ever saw him again.

Hobbes's father was succeeded in the curacy of Brokenborough by a man in his late twenties called Robert Latimer,[9] who was destined to play a more formative role in shaping the young Hobbes's life than his own father ever seems to have done. A graduate of Magdalen Hall, Oxford,[10] Latimer had arrived at Westport directly from university in the mid-1590s to run a small private school.[11] Hobbes attended this establishment from about the age of ten,[12] and it is a fact of great importance in Hobbes's intellectual development that Robert Latimer was able to provide him with an excellent grounding in the humanistic curriculum then typical of the Elizabethan grammar schools.[13] This training mainly centred on the study of the classical languages, and the young Hobbes duly succeeded (as we shall see in chapter 2) in acquiring an extraordinarily high level of proficiency in Latin and Greek. But the study of classical rhetoric would also have formed a significant part of his education, and this too is important (as we shall see in chapter 3) in relation to explaining the evolution of his thought. Hobbes makes no mention of Latimer in either of his autobiographies,[14] but he undoubtedly owed his schoolmaster a major intellectual debt.

[5] So says Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 323, who also speaks of his 'ignorance and clownery'.
[6] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 387.
[7] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 387. Cf. Malcolm 1996, p. 15.
[8] See Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 387 for the incident and Malcolm 1996, p. 15 for the date.
[9] Malcolm 1996, p. 16 has established this fascinating fact. I infer Latimer's age at the time from the fact that, according to Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 328, Latimer was 'a young man of about nineteen or twenty' when Hobbes began attending his school in the late 1590s. But Latimer may have been older than Aubrey supposed. Foster 1891–2, vol. 3, p. 884 records that Latimer took his BA at Magdalen Hall as early as 1591, proceeding to an MA at Magdalen College in 1595.
[10] Foster 1891–2, vol. 3, p. 884. Cf. Malcolm 1996, p. 16.
[11] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 328.
[12] This can be inferred from the fact that, as Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 328 informs us, after finishing his 'petty' training at the church school in Westport at the age of eight, Hobbes attended a school run by the minister in Malmesbury before moving to Latimer's establishment.
[13] For this curriculum see Skinner 1996, pp. 19–65.
[14] It will be best to say a word about Hobbes's autobiographies at the outset, given that they provide such important insights into his career, and will be frequently cited not merely in the present Introduction but in several later chapters. Hobbes tells us in Hobbes 1839b, p. xcix, line 375 that he wrote his verse *Vita*, much the longer of his two autobiographical sketches, at the age of eighty-four – that is, in 1672. Hobbes MSS (Chatsworth) MS A. 6 is Hobbes's corrected manuscript copy, and provides a more authoritative text than Hobbes 1839b, the version printed by Molesworth. I have therefore preferred to quote from the Chatsworth manuscript, although

As a younger son, Hobbes may have been intended for the church,[15] and this may help to explain how it came about that his father's elder brother, a childless and prosperous glover, agreed to pay for Hobbes to be sent to university.[16] No doubt as a result of Latimer's advice, Hobbes followed in his teacher's footsteps and went to Magdalen Hall Oxford, where he took his bachelor's degree in 1608.[17] But instead of seeking ecclesiastical preferment he immediately followed the no less time-honoured path of joining an aristocratic household. As soon as he graduated, he entered the service of William Cavendish, a Derbyshire landowner who became the first Earl of Devonshire in 1618. Hobbes's initial duties were those of tutor and companion to Cavendish's son, the future second earl, who also bore the name William Cavendish.[18] Subsequently, Hobbes went on to act as secretary to the younger Cavendish,[19] but reverted to his tutorial role soon after the second earl's sudden death in 1628.[20] The third earl – yet another William Cavendish – was barely eleven years old at the time,[21] and Hobbes was asked to take charge of his education, a task that occupied him for seven painstaking years (as he put it in his verse *Vita*) until Cavendish attained his majority in 1638.[22]

It is important to underline the extent to which, as this sketch already indicates, Hobbes was a product of the literary culture of humanism. As we shall see in chapter 2, the values of the *studia humanitatis* largely underpin the syllabus he worked out for the instruction of the third earl in the 1630s. Hobbes himself draws attention to the point when referring to his tutorial labours in his verse *Vita*. Although he mentions that he taught the young earl some logic, arithmetic and geography,[23] he stresses that they mainly concentrated on the three basic elements of the *studia humanitatis*: grammar, rhetoric and poetry. They began 'by learning the meaning of the speech used by the Romans, and how to join Latin words

my page references are to the Molesworth edition. Tricaud 1985, pp. 280–1 has established that Hobbes's shorter prose *Vita* was partly drafted in the 1650s and given its final form only a few months before his death in 1679.

[15] A point helpfully made in Malcolm 1996, p. 15.

[16] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 324.

[17] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 330. It is not known exactly when Hobbes matriculated. See Malcolm 1996, p. 39. But Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, pp. 328, 330 is probably correct in stating that Hobbes entered the university at the beginning of 1603.

[18] Malcolm 1994c, pp. 807–8.

[19] See Hobbes MSS (Chatsworth) MS 73Aa, flyleaf, where Hobbes identifies himself as 'secretary to ye Lord Cavendysh'. Hobbes also refers to himself on the title-page of Hobbes 1629 as 'Secretary to ye late Earle of Devonshire'.

[20] Malcolm 1994c, p. 815.

[21] Malcolm 1994c, p. 815 notes that the third earl was born in 1617.

[22] Hobbes 1839b, p. lxxxix, line 103. Cf. Malcolm 1994c, pp. 808–9 and 815–17.

[23] Hobbes 1839b, p. lxxxix, lines 99–101.

together in the proper way'.[24] Then they went on to consider 'how poetry is composed' and at the same time 'how orators write, and by means of what art rhetoricians are accustomed to deceive the uninitiated'.[25] As Hobbes adds in his prose *Vita*, what he provided for his pupil was thus an education *in literis*, the traditional humanistic ideal of 'good letters'.[26]

A similar preoccupation with rhetoric and poetry is apparent in Hobbes's own earliest works. One of the tasks he set himself while tutoring the third earl was to produce a Latin paraphrase of Aristotle's *Art of Rhetoric*, an English version of which was published anonymously as *A Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique* in c.1637.[27] Although Hobbes professed to despise Aristotle as a philosopher of nature, and declared him to be 'the worst teacher that ever was, the worst politician and ethick', he nevertheless acknowledged that his *Rhetoric* was 'rare'.[28] One sign of its impact on Hobbes's thinking has frequently been remarked upon. When Hobbes turns to examine the character of the 'affections' in chapters 8 and 9 of *The Elements of Law*, he enunciated a number of his definitions in the form of virtual quotations from Aristotle's analysis of the emotions in the opening chapters of Book 2 of the *Rhetoric*.[29] But a further and connected use of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in *The Elements* has been little discussed. When Hobbes asks himself in chapter 9 – and again in chapter 6 of *Leviathan* – about the nature of the emotions expressed by the peculiar phenomenon of laughter, he proceeds to outline a theory of the ridiculous that closely resembles that of Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*. I offer a survey in chapter 5 of this Aristotelian tradition of thinking about the laughable, and ask at

[24] Hobbes 1839b, p. lxxxviii, lines 95–6:

> Hunc Romanarum sensus cognoscere vocum;
> Jungere quoque decet verba Latina modo.

[25] Hobbes 1839b, p. lxxxviii, lines 97–8:

> Fallere quaque solent indoctos rhetores arte;
> Quid facit Orator, quidque Poeta facit.

[26] Hobbes 1839a, p. xiv.

[27] For the Latin paraphrase see Hobbes MSS (Chatsworth) MS D. 1, pp. 1–143. It contains numerous corrections in Hobbes's hand and must in substance be Hobbes's work. [Hobbes (?)] 1986, an English translation of this manuscript, has always been credited to Hobbes as well. But a number of anomalies and misunderstandings in the translation have led Karl Schuhmann to the dramatic but convincing conclusion that, while the Latin paraphrase is by Hobbes, the English translation is not.

[28] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 357.

[29] See Aristotle 1926, II. 1. 8 to II. 11. 7, pp. 172–246, and for discussions of the parallels see Strauss 1963, pp. 36–41; Zappen 1983; Skinner 1996, pp. 38–9.

the same time why that tradition appears to have mattered so much to Hobbes.

Hobbes's next work reflected an even keener interest in the other basic element in the *studia humanitatis*, the art of poetry. Around the year 1627[30] Hobbes composed a Latin poem of some five hundred hexameters, *De Mirabilibus Pecci*, *Carmen*, which he presented as a gift to the second earl and subsequently published in c.1636.[31] But by far the most important product of Hobbes's so-called 'humanist period'[32] was his translation of Thucydides's history, which he published as *Eight Bookes of the Peloponnesian Warre* in 1629.[33] Hobbes's introductory essay, *Of the Life and History of Thucydides*, is a thoroughly humanist text. As I seek to demonstrate in chapter 2, it is wholly constructed according to the precepts laid down in classical handbooks of rhetoric for the presentation of persuasive arguments, as well as being founded on the humanist assumption that 'the principal and proper work of history' is 'to instruct and enable men, by the knowledge of actions past, to bear themselves prudently in the present and providently towards the future'.[34]

III

During the 1630s Hobbes began to direct his intellectual energies along new paths. He began to turn away from – and against – his humanist allegiances, and to take an increasingly professional interest in the study of mathematics and the natural sciences. Hobbes's correspondence from this period suggests that his scientific curiosity was quickened as a result of his acquaintance with the Earl of Devonshire's cousins, the Earl of Newcastle and his younger brother Sir Charles Cavendish, both of whom were conducting experiments at the earl's principal residence, Welbeck Abbey in Nottinghamshire.[35] By 1636 we find Hobbes writing confidently to Newcastle on a variety of scientific themes. He offers an opinion about local motion and its relation to heat, about Galileo's theory of colour and light, and more generally about the nature of scientific proof.[36] He also discusses the optical experiments being carried out at

[30] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 360 supplies the date.
[31] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 360. Wood 1691–2, p. 479 adds that the poem was first 'printed at *Lond.* about 1636'.
[32] For this concept see Strauss 1963, p. 30; Reik 1977 and especially Schuhmann 1990.
[33] Hobbes 1629. [34] Hobbes 1975a, p. 6.
[35] See Malcolm 1994c, pp. 801–5 and pp. 812–15.
[36] Hobbes 1994, Letter 19, pp. 33–4 and Letter 21, pp. 37–8.

Welbeck by Robert Payne, who soon became a close friend.[37] Payne was employed by Newcastle nominally as his chaplain, but devoted much of his time in the mid-1630s to studying the phenomenon of refracted light, a subject that rapidly attracted Hobbes's attention as well.[38]

Hobbes's shift from the humanities to the sciences appears to have happened rather suddenly. So it seems natural to ask whether the moment of conversion can be pinpointed with any accuracy. Hobbes himself supplies a very precise date. Accused of plagiarism at one point in his bruising controversy with Descartes in 1641, he retorted that he had first articulated his theories about 'the nature and production of light, sound and all phantasms or ideas' in the presence of 'those most excellent brothers William Earl of Newcastle and Sir Charles Cavendish' as early as the year 1630.[39] It seems to have been this declaration that prompted Ferdinand Tönnies to attribute to Hobbes, and to date to the year 1630, an anonymous manuscript to which Tönnies gave the title *A Short Tract on First Principles*.[40] The authorship of the *Short Tract* has of late been a subject of intense debate,[41] but it is certainly clear that the ideas it contains are at least partly those of Hobbes.[42] Although it includes some claims that Hobbes was subsequently to repudiate,[43] it is written in his familiar demonstrative style and contributes to his long-standing ambition to outline a purely mechanistic conception of nature.

The *Short Tract* appears to have been completed in 1632–3.[44] Soon after this, Hobbes's scientific interests deepened as a result of various contacts he made on a visit to France and Italy with the third Earl of Devonshire between 1634 and 1636.[45] The most important friendship he struck up in this period was with Marin Mersenne, who acted as the convenor of regular scientific meetings at the Convent of the Annunciation in Paris, where he lived as a member of the Minim Friars.[46] Hobbes indicates in his

[37] Hobbes 1994, Letter 16, pp. 28–9.
[38] On Payne see Malcolm 1994c, pp. 872–7.
[39] Hobbes 1994, Letter 34, p. 108.
[40] Tönnies 1969a, Appendix I, p. 193.
[41] For a critical edition of the text see [Hobbes (?)] 1988. Bernhardt 1988, pp. 88–92 insists on Hobbes's authorship, while Zagorin 1993 and Schuhmann 1995 advance powerful arguments in favour of it. But Malcolm 1994c, p. 874 remains unconvinced, observing that the *Short Tract* is in Robert Payne's handwriting and inferring that the work 'can plausibly be attributed' to him. Raylor 2001 outlines the debate, concluding that the tract was indeed written by Payne, but that its ideas are at least in part those of Hobbes.
[42] Schuhmann 1995 and Raylor 2001 make this clear beyond doubt.
[43] For example, about the nature of light and its propagation. See Prins 1996, pp. 129–32 and cf. Hobbes 1998.
[44] Schuhmann 1995, p. 26.
[45] See Malcolm 1996, p. 23 for details of Hobbes's itinerary.
[46] Dear 1988, p. 14. Cf. Hobbes 1985, p. 351.

prose *Vita* that Mersenne first welcomed him into this circle in 1635, and that thereafter they 'communicated daily about my thoughts'.[47] These meetings appear to have aroused in Hobbes an almost obsessional desire to understand the laws of physics, and above all the phenomenon of motion. In his verse *Vita* he recalls that, after setting out for Italy with the young earl in the autumn of 1635,[48] 'I began to think about the nature of things all the time, whether I was on a ship, in a coach, or travelling on horseback.'[49] He makes it clear that his thinking was based on a rejection of the Aristotelian assumption that the truth about the world must be closely connected with its appearance. On the contrary, Hobbes tells us, 'it seemed to me that there is only one thing in the whole world that is real, although it is falsified in a number of ways'.[50] This single reality is motion, 'which is why anyone who wishes to understand physics must first of all devote themselves wholeheartedly to studying what makes motion possible'.[51]

Back in England at the end of 1636, Hobbes began to elaborate this basic insight as a claim about three types of bodies. 'The whole *genus* of philosophy', he came to believe, 'contains just three parts: *Corpus*, *Homo*, *Civis*, body, man and citizen.'[52] Armed with these fundamental categories, he found himself able, he reports, 'to move from the various types of motion to the variety of things, that is, to different species and elements of matter,

[47] Hobbes 1839a, p. xiv: 'cogitatis suis cum Reverendo Patre Marino Mersenno . . . quotidie communicatis'. This is confirmed in Blackbourne 1839, p. xxviii. See also Hobbes 1839b, p. xc, line 127, which speaks of communicating with Mersenne 'anew' on returning to Paris in 1636 after wintering in Italy. Hobbes 1994, Letters 12 to 16, pp. 22–30 make it clear that Hobbes was in Paris for at least a year between autumn 1634 and 1635. See Jacoby 1974, pp. 62–3 and for a classic discussion of the importance of this visit see Brandt 1928, pp. 149–60.

[48] Hobbes 1994, Letter 16 (25 August 1635) pp. 28–9, shows Hobbes still in Paris. Hobbes 1994, Letter 17 (16 April 1636) pp. 30–1, sent from Florence, speaks of having arrived there after a stay in Rome.

[49] Hobbes 1839b, p. lxxxix, lines 109–10:

> Ast ergo perpetuo natura cogito rerum,
> Seu rate, seu curru, sive ferebar equo.

[50] Hobbes 1839b, p. lxxxix, lines 111–12:

> Et mihi visa quidem est toto res unica mundo
> Vera, licet multis falsificata modis:

[51] Hobbes 1839b, p. lxxxix, lines 119–20:

> Hinc est quod, physicam quisquis vult discere, motus
> Quid possit, debet perdidicisse prius.

[52] Hobbes 1839b, p. xc, lines 137–8:

> Nam philosophandi
> Corpus, Homo, Civis continet omne genus.

and from there to the internal motions of men and the secrets of the heart, and from there, finally, to the blessings of Sovereignty and Justice'.[53] With this outline firmly in mind, he goes on, 'I decided to write three books on these issues, and started to collect my materials every day.'[54]

By the end of the 1630s Hobbes had made considerable progress with this tripartite scheme. Admittedly there is little evidence that he had made much headway with the first of his projected volumes, *De Corpore*, which he finally managed to publish only in 1655. But by 1640 he had finished a major Latin manuscript treatise on optics,[55] the subject of the opening half of his second projected volume, *De Homine*, which eventually appeared in 1658.[56] And in May 1640 he completed the manuscript of *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, the latter part of which consists of a polished sketch of his promised third volume on the blessings of sovereignty and justice.[57]

Soon after circulating this manuscript Hobbes begin to fear for his safety in consequence of the worsening political crisis in England. Forced to reconvene Parliament in 1640 after a gap of eleven years, King Charles I found himself obliged to stand by while his advisers were arrested and his regime denounced. Among those sent to the Tower by parliamentary order was Roger Maynwaring, who had preached as royal chaplain in favour of the absolute power of kings.[58] Hobbes told John Aubrey that he

[53] Hobbes 1839b, p. xc, lines 133–6:

> Motibus a variis feror ad rerum variarum
> Dissimiles species, materiaeque dolos;
> Motusque internos hominum, cordisque latebras:
> Denique ad Imperii Justitiaeque bona.

[54] Hobbes 1839b, p. xc, lines 139–40:

> Tres super his rebus statuo conscribere libros;
> Materiemque mihi congero quoque die.

[55] BL Harl. MS 6796, fos. 193–266. The date of this manuscript has been established in Malcolm 1994b, pp. liii–lv, where it is shown that it was transcribed in 1640 for Sir Charles Cavendish. As Hobbes's correspondence indicates, he was spurred to write by the appearance of Descartes's *Dioptrique*, the essay on optics published as an appendix to the *Discours de la méthode* in 1637. Hobbes must have been one of Descartes's earliest English readers. Hobbes 1994, Letter 27, p. 51 shows that he received a copy of the *Discours* as early as 4 October 1637.

[56] Hobbes 1839d, chs. 2 to 9, pp. 7–87. As Robertson 1886, p. 59n. first noticed, these chapters are virtually identical with those on vision in BL Harl. MS 3360 fos. 73^{r}–173^{r}, the English manuscript treatise on optics which Hobbes completed early in 1646.

[57] As Tönnies 1969a, pp. v–viii first recognised, *The Elements* is the work described in Hobbes 1840d, p. 414 as the 'little treatise in English', of which 'though not printed, many gentlemen had copies'. The standard edition is Hobbes 1969a, but it contains so many transcription errors that I have preferred – in this and in subsequent chapters – to quote instead from BL Harl. MS 4235, arguably the best surviving manuscript, although my page references are to the 1969 edition.

[58] Sommerville 1992, pp. 18–19.

regarded Maynwaring's doctrines as essentially the same as his own,[59] and feared that he might suffer a similar fate.[60] The upshot, Aubrey reports, was that 'then thought Mr. Hobbes, 'tis time now for me to shift for my selfe, and so withdrew into France and resided at Paris'.[61]

IV

Hobbes lived in France for the next eleven years, continuing to work on his physics and on the application of his scientific principles to civic life. He made his first task that of completing the sketch of his political theory he had already circulated. The outcome was the appearance of *Elementorum Philosophiae Sectio Tertia De Cive* at Paris in 1642.[62] The full title signals the intended place of the work in Hobbes's tripartite division of philosophy, but the delays attending the completion of his trilogy proved so protracted that, when this final section was reissued in two further editions at Amsterdam in 1647, it appeared instead under its shorter and more familiar title as *De Cive*.[63]

One striking feature not merely of *De Cive* but of Hobbes's earlier sketch in *The Elements of Law* is the vehemence with which he repudiates the values of the rhetorical culture in which he had originally been nurtured. One of his principal purposes in both these works is to challenge and overturn the central tenets of Renaissance civil science and replace them with a new conception of *scientia civilis* founded on authentically scientific premisses. In chapters 3 and 4 I seek to illustrate these claims at greater length. In chapter 3 I begin by laying out the classical assumption that a civil science must be founded on a union of reason and rhetoric, and hence of science and eloquence. I then show how Hobbes sought to discredit and replace this approach by disjoining the science of politics from any connection with the rhetorical arts. In chapter 4 I turn to consider the fundamental rhetorical assumption that all moral questions are susceptible of being debated *in utramque partem*, on either side of the case. I seek to establish that one of Hobbes's leading aims as a moral philosopher was to undermine and supersede this style of argument by fixing the definitions and implications of moral terms in a purportedly scientific way.

After the publication of *De Cive* in 1642, Hobbes reverted to working on his philosophical system in the order in which he had originally conceived

[59] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 334.
[60] This is especially clear from Hobbes 1994, Letter 35, pp. 114–15.
[61] Aubrey 1898, vol. 1, p. 334.
[62] See Hobbes 1642 and cf. Hobbes 1983a.
[63] For these two further editions see Warrender 1983a, pp. 8–13.

it. The first important piece of writing to which this gave rise was a lengthy critical examination of Thomas White's treatise *De Mundo*.[64] 'The most learned Mr White', as Hobbes called him,[65] was an English Catholic priest and a fellow exile well known to Hobbes,[66] whose *De Mundo* had been published in September 1642.[67] Hobbes drafted his reply during the winter of 1642 and spring of 1643,[68] producing a massive if somewhat diffuse manuscript in which he discussed, among many other things, several of the questions eventually handled in *De Corpore*, including such topics as place, cause, motion, circular motion and the behaviour of heavenly bodies.[69]

After sketching this outline of his natural philosophy, Hobbes turned to the business of working it out in detail. An early outcome was *Of Liberty and Necessity*, which he composed in the form of a letter to the marquis (as he had become) of Newcastle in the summer of 1645, having conducted a debate on the subject with John Bramhall in Newcastle's presence in Paris earlier in the same year.[70] Pursuing an argument already implicit in the *Short Tract*,[71] and further developed in the analysis of deliberation in his *Critique* of White,[72] Hobbes provides an elegant solution to the problem of how to render metaphysical determinism compatible with the idea of free action. I examine his solution – which he subsequently incorporated into his civil philosophy – in the course of chapter 7.[73]

The main project to which Hobbes devoted himself after finishing his critique of *De Mundo* was the completion of the opening volume in his projected trilogy.[74] Recalling this period in his verse *Vita*, he remembered it as a time when 'I thought night and day for four years about the form of my book *De Corpore* and how it should be written'.[75] It soon became clear, however, that the task he had set himself was even harder than he

[64] For the manuscript see Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin MS 6566A. For the dating see Jacquot and Jones 1973, pp. 12–13, 43–5.
[65] Hobbes 1840a, p. 236.
[66] On White and Hobbes see Southgate 1993, pp. 7–8, 28–9.
[67] Southgate 1993, p. 7.
[68] Jacquot and Jones 1973, pp. 43–5.
[69] Hobbes 1839c, chs. 7, 9, 15–16, 21–2, 25–6. Cf. Hobbes 1973, chs. 4, 7, 14, 22, 30.
[70] These facts are established in Lessay 1993b, pp. 31–8. On Newcastle's circle in Paris see Jacob and Raylor 1991, pp. 215–22.
[71] [Hobbes (?) 1988], Section 1, Conclusions 11–13, pp. 20–2.
[72] BN Fonds Latin MS 6566A, fos. 349^{v}–351^{v}. Cf. Hobbes 1973, chapter 30, sections 26 to 30, pp. 360–2.
[73] For further discussion of the debate with Bramhall see Overhoff 2000, pp. 134–41.
[74] This is made clear in Hobbes 1839b, p. xci, lines 159–60.
[75] Hobbes 1839b, p. xci, lines 159–60:

> Inde annis quatuor libri *De Corpore* formam,
> Qua sit scribendus, nocte dieque puto.