UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

https://helda.helsinki.fi

Communication : the correspondence of Thomas Hobbes : some new items

Malcolm, Noel; Tolonen, Mikko

2008
Cambridge University Press
http://hdl.handle.net/10138/156258
Malcolm, N & Tolonen, M 2008, 'Communication : the correspondence of Thomas Hobbes : some new items', Historical Journal, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 481-495. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X08006791

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository. https://helda.helsinki.fi
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.
Please cite the original version.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF THOMAS HOBBES: SOME NEW ITEMS

by NOEL MALCOLM (*All Souls College, Oxford*) and MIKKO TOLONEN (*University of Helsinki*)

The first collected edition of Hobbes's correspondence was published in 1994.[1] In its preface, the editor asked the question, 'How can an editor of an author's complete correspondence know that his edition is complete?', and replied: 'The short answer is that he cannot.'[2] Given that Hobbes lived to the age of ninety-one, and had a wide range of intellectual contacts in England and abroad, the tally of his surviving correspondence (roughly 211 items, depending on how a 'letter' is defined) is surprisingly small; this encourages the belief that other letters must remain in the archives, as yet undiscovered. But since 1994 only one new item has been published: a letter sent to Hobbes in Paris by his old friend Robert Payne in 1649. That letter is a document of unusual importance, as it represents, in effect, an attempt to parry or soften the anti-episcopal arguments of *Leviathan* at a time when that book was in preparation.[3]

Nothing else of comparable significance has yet come to light. The purpose of this communication is to put forward a number of more modest discoveries, some of which amount only to small fragments, or traces of letters which are known to have been preserved for a long time after Hobbes's death, but which are as yet unlocated. (With a figure of Hobbes's stature, nevertheless, even the smallest fragments may be of some

value to future researchers.) First it presents the text of a complete letter to Hobbes, found by Dr Arnold Hunt in Lambeth Palace Library. Then it gives the details of three letters: two addressed to Hobbes and one by him. The present location of these letters is not known; the details of them were found by Mikko Tolonen when making a systematic study of entries in catalogues issued by nineteenth-century dealers and auction houses. Further, a few new examples are given of what were described in the preface to the 1994 edition as 'non-letters' (items referred to elsewhere, incorrectly, as letters to or from Hobbes); their listing here may, it is hoped, save future researchers some time and trouble. And, finally, details are given of additional manuscript versions of two letters which were printed in that edition.

I

The following item, a letter from Thomas Barlow to Hobbes of 30 August 1658, is in Lambeth Palace Library; it was given by Miss H. Barlow (through the Friends of Lambeth Palace Library) in 1975.[4] The earliest trace of this item in the sales catalogues is in the Sotheby's sale of 17 June 1842, where it was described as 'Dr. Barlow, an eminent divine, to Thomas Hobbes, August 28th 1658'; the annotated copy of the auction catalogue notes that the letter was sold to 'Pickering' for 6*s*.[5] This was the bookseller and publisher William Pickering, whose collection of manuscripts, sold after his death in 1854, also included one of the manuscripts of Hobbes's *Elements of law*.[6] But William Pickering did not keep the Barlow letter for long: it next appeared in a catalogue issued by the dealer Thomas Rodd in 1845.[7] Presumably a member of the Barlow family bought

it, out of familial piety, and it thus passed eventually to Miss H. Barlow, who gave it to Lambeth Palace.

Thomas Barlow to Hobbes, from Oxford

30 August [/9 September] 1658

Original, in Barlow's hand

S^{r}.

I receaued (by y^{e} hands of your great seruant, and my freind M^{r}. Stubbe)[8] that excellent booke you sent me,[9] for which I returne my most harty thankes, and shall keepe it as a lastinge monument of your (euery way) vndeserued kindnesse. I must confesse (with that liberty and fredome which all ingenuous persons giue and take) that I cannot (at p[re]sent) giue my consent to all that you haue said, nor dare I suddenly censure or condemne, what soe eminent a p[er]son hath writt, and vpon seacond thoughts, and mature deliberation published. But for y^{e} maine of your booke (especially the Optique part)[10] the ingenuity of the invention, and perspicuity of y^{e} Demonstration is such, as will possibly haue envy from this age, and certainely honor from posterity – *Extinctus amabitur* &c.[11] Sure I am, y^{e} great benefitt I haue gott by diuerse of your learned workes, and your many Ciuilities to me, are high obligations to loue and honor you, and if euer it by [*sic*] in my power

to serue you, or any friend of yours, be assured of this, you may haue many more able, but none more willinge then –

(Sr.)

Your affectionate freind, and seru[t]

Th. Barlow.

Q. Coll. Oxon

Aug. XXX. M.DC.LVIII.

[*addressed:*] For my most honored and worthy friend M[r]. Thom: Hobbes

these

[*endorsed by James Wheldon:*][12] D[r]. Barlow Aug. 30[th]. 1658.

Thomas Barlow (1608/9-91) was a significant figure in Interregnum Oxford, where he served as Keeper of the Bodleian Library (from 1652) and Provost of the Queen's College (from 1658). He enjoyed not only a high reputation as a scholar, but also good relations with more than one part of the religious-political spectrum: scholastic in philosophy, Calvinist in theology, and a moderate Anglican in ecclesiology, he kept in contact with royalist Anglicans and was cherished by the Independents (above all, by his former pupil John Owen) as a useful ally in their campaign against presbyterianism. It was evidently with that campaign in mind that Henry Stubbe, the maverick Independent and Hobbesian who served as Barlow's deputy at the Bodleian, tried to create friendly

relations between Hobbes and Barlow, and encouraged Hobbes to send a copy of the English version of his *De corpore* to Barlow in 1656. (That volume also included Hobbes's *Six lessons to the professors of the mathematiques*, with its stinging attack on the intellectual leader of the presbyterians in Oxford, John Wallis.) Barlow's long letter of thanks for that gift, while emphasizing that 'I doe not concurre with your judgement in euery thinge', did plainly state that 'I concurre in what you say of y^{e} Scotch Diuines', and maintained a friendly and respectful tone throughout.[13]

This new letter indicates that Stubbe was still making similar efforts two years later. But this time the gift – Hobbes's *De homine*, a treatise on optics and psychology – was less suitable for establishing an ideological connection; Barlow's letter, while still respectful, is shorter and more non-committal. The actual volume sent by Hobbes to Barlow survives in the library of the Queen's College, and the notes added to it by Barlow provide further evidence that may explain the cautious nature of this letter.[14] While the optical parts of the book receive no annotation whatsoever, there is a small flurry of underlinings and marginal notes in chapter 14, 'De religione'. Against the first paragraph, where Hobbes defined religion as the external worship of God and also stated that faith and worship are the two parts of religion, Barlow underlined the definition and wrote in the margin: 'If religion is external worship, how does it come about that faith is a part of it?'[15] Against the third paragraph Barlow noted, with evident disapproval, Hobbes's view that 'faith is opinion', and then summarized his argument that 'in supernatural matters, no one should be believed unless he performs miracles' – an argument with potentially devastating consequences for almost any form of modern ecclesiastical authority.[16] In the next paragraph, Barlow's anxious pen underlined parts of

the sentences in which Hobbes argued first that 'Religion, therefore, is not philosophy but rather, in every commonwealth, law – and therefore should be obeyed, not argued about', and then that 'The things that are argued about are only those things over which one person disagrees with another; which things, therefore, are not matters of faith in God.'[17] At the sixth paragraph, Barlow repeated in the margin Hobbes's argument that 'the death of Christ was not a punishment for our sins'.[18] And finally, in the next paragraph, where Hobbes strongly objected to the Protestant claim that justice and other moral virtues are, considered purely in themselves, 'shining sins', Barlow underlined part of the sentence, 'For indeed, if they were sins, the more someone exceeded other people in holiness, the less that person should be believed, on the grounds that he must be less just.'[19] Here Barlow may have suspected that Hobbes's arguments, hitherto damaging enough to traditional notions of faith, the Church, and controversial theology, were now becoming tinged with sarcasm and ridicule; and his suspicion may not have been incorrect.

II

Auction catalogues and dealers' catalogues offer a rich – and surprisingly under-utilized – resource for intellectual historians and literary scholars. If the catalogues of sales of manuscripts and autograph letters of the major dealers (Sotheby's, Christies, Puttick and Simpson, Thomas Thorpe, Thomas Rodd) were digitized and combined in a searchable database, this would be of great assistance to many lines of inquiry, and would very probably yield a significant quantity of hitherto unknown items by philosophers and other

writers. (To give just one example: a search among such catalogues for items of David Hume's correspondence has brought to light records of more than twenty letters that are not contained in the modern edition.)[20]

The following three Hobbes items have been brought to light by such researches. In each case, the present location of the letter is unknown.

(i) Hobbes to William Cavendish, third earl of Devonshire, from Paris, [1/] 11 June 1641

This letter was sold by Sotheby's on 3 June 1895. Nothing is known of its contents; the lot description was merely as follows: 'Hobbes (Thomas) Philosopher, A. L. s. [*sc*. Autograph Letter, signed] 1 p. 4to, *Paris*, *June* 11, 1641, to the Earl of Devonshire, *portrait, rare*'. It came from the collection of William and Thomas Bateman, and was sold to 'Pearson' for £19 5*s*.[21] William Bateman (1787-1835) was a Derbyshire antiquary who assembled a 'fine library and museum', and his son Thomas (1821-61) devoted much of his life to the history and archaeology of the region.[22] Presumably this letter was acquired by one or other of them for the sake of its local associations: the Cavendishes of Chatsworth were the leading family in Derbyshire, and Hobbes had written a poem about the Peak District.[23] 'Pearson' was John Pearson of Pearson and Co., an important dealer and collector, whose personal collection was sold at Sotheby's on 29 March 1922; but this item was not included there, and its fate is unknown.

Since this letter took up only one quarto page, it may have been little more than a dutiful letter of compliments to Hobbes's former employer. Another short letter from Hobbes to the earl survives (though only in a nineteenth-century facsimile – its present

location is also unknown), dated 23 July / 2 August 1641, so it would seem that Hobbes was writing fairly often to the earl at this time.[24] But that letter does include some comments on contemporary developments in England, and on the relationship between church and state; something of similar significance might well have been included in the missing letter of [1/] 11 June.

(ii) Theodor Mustert to Hobbes, from London, 10 [/20] September 1656

This letter was listed in no fewer than five catalogues issued by the dealer Thomas Thorpe between *c*. 1834 and 1843.[25] The signature was apparently hard to read: in the first catalogue the name was given as 'Theodorus M. Stert', while in the others it was 'Theodore Mistert'. The first catalogue also reproduced the wording that followed the signature: 'Phil. et. Med. Studiosi, Frisii Orientalis' ('one who studies philosophy and medicine, from East Friesland'), and described the letter as 'Treating generally of the Cartesian Philosophy'.[26] The second and third catalogues quoted a sentence, presumably from the end of the letter: 'Quaeso, si placet, responsum mittere ad Thomam Johnson Bibliopolam in Caemeterio S^{ti} Pauli' ('I beg you, please, to send your answer to Thomas Johnson, bookseller, in St Paul's Churchyard').[27] All catalogues described the letter as 'autograph' and in Latin; the second and third quoted the place and date verbatim, '*Londini*, 10 *Septembris*, 1656'.

The writer of this letter has not found his way into any standard reference works; but a few details can be established. An entry in the matriculation register of the University of Groningen for 4 March 1652 reads: 'Theodorus Mustert, Emdanus, Phil.'.[28] This

identifies him as both a student of philosophy – hence the special interest in 'Cartesian Philosophy', a matter much discussed at Groningen University – and an inhabitant of Emden (which matches the statement in the letter that he was from East Friesland).[29] The Musterts were a successful merchant family in Emden in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: Peter or Pieter Mustert, who was probably Theodor's father, was a corn-trader with strong connections to the Netherlands; he was a controller of the city markets, a member of the council of the city between 1640 and his death in 1645, and, as nominated by the council in 1640, a member of the 'collegium' of administrators of the Estates of East Friesland.[30] It would appear that, having completed his degree at Groningen, Theodor went on the sort of travels that were commonly undertaken by graduates of Dutch and north German universities. ('Phil. et Med. Studiosi' could mean that he had also enrolled as a student of medicine, in which case the travels may perhaps have been an interlude between two degree courses.) While in London he sent a letter, probably at a venture, to Hobbes; his action here was not unlike that of the young French physician Pierre Guisony, who wrote to Hobbes while on a visit to England in 1659.[31] It is noteworthy that Hobbes did reply to Guisony (though that letter has not survived); possibly he replied also to Mustert, responding to his questions about the 'Cartesian Philosophy', in a letter which has yet to be discovered in a Dutch or north German archive.[32]

(iii) William Cavendish, first earl and first marquess (later first duke) of Newcastle, to Hobbes, from Welbeck Abbey, Notts., 13 [/23] February 1661 [/1662]

This item was offered for sale by Thomas Thorpe in 1833. He described the letter, and gave extracts from it, as follows:

> Letter, entirely autograph, 'For my worthy Friend, Mr. Hobbs,' dated Welbeck, the 13th of Feb. 1661, fine condition, with Seal, 18*s*.
>
> Requesting Hobbes to superintend the having some cases or tuns made for the glasses that are to be sent up from Welbecke, 'because ther Is Exselente worke-men att London, which by your directions will make them Exactlye Exselente. Sir Paule Neale Is a great predender [*sic*], so that hee may Informe you of the best worke-men.' Hopes to see him in the summer at Welbeck; desires the bills may be given to 'Powell, a seruante to my son Mansfield, whoe shall paye them.'[33]

Apparently the letter failed to sell; four years later Thorpe advertised it again, listing it merely as 'Newcastle (W. Cavendish, Earl of) Autograph letter to T. Hobbes, 15*s*. Welbeck, 1661'.[34] Its eventual fate is not known.

This letter is of interest for more than one reason. What happened to Hobbes's relationship with this William Cavendish in the latter part of their lives has long been one of the minor mysteries of Hobbes's biography. In the 1630s the earl of Newcastle and his brother, Sir Charles Cavendish, played an essential role in stimulating Hobbes's development as a philosopher – not merely as rich patrons, but as people whose active intellectual interests strongly coincided with his. Hobbes's relations with them were resumed in Paris in 1645-8, when Newcastle took an interest in both his work on optics and his combative views on 'liberty and necessity'. Thereafter, however, although

Hobbes kept up some connection with Sir Charles Cavendish (until the latter's death in 1654) and with Newcastle's wife (whom he thanked for the gift of one of her books in February 1662), evidence of direct contacts between Hobbes and Newcastle has been entirely lacking.[35] This letter, however, suggests that quite a cordial and familiar relationship continued between the two in the early Restoration period; so it seems that a misleading impression has been created merely by the fact that much of Newcastle's personal archive from that period has not survived. Since Hobbes's letter to Newcastle's wife, thanking her for her book, was dated 9 [/19] February, it looks as if this letter from Newcastle was prompted by the receipt of Hobbes's letter, or of an accompanying letter to Newcastle himself; this need not indicate a pattern of regular correspondence, but the greeting, 'For my worthy friend', and the remark about hoping to see Hobbes at Welbeck in the summer, do suggest that personal relations between them were still quite close.

A search for corroborative evidence among Newcastle's household papers has yielded the following item, which sheds more light on this episode. It is a letter from Humfrey Poole, the third earl of Devonshire's steward at Chatsworth, to his opposite number, Andrew Clayton, the marquess of Newcastle's steward at Welbeck, written just three days after the letter listed above.

> Good M^{r} Clayton:
>
> I haue lately rec^{d} a letter from M^{r} Hobbes; and according to his desire, I should now haue attended vpon my Lord Marquis of Newcastle, with certaine perspectiue glasses, to bee deliuered to him, But Sir; I am at present, (and haue been most of this winter,) so extreamly obstructed, in, and about my Splen; that I can scarse goe

twenty yards on foot for want of winde, and therefore, as vnfitt, as vnable, to appeare now to his Lordship: But M^{r} Clayton, I haue now sent my sonne with those glasses and all their appurtenances, iust, and exactly, as they were left wth mee, desiring, that yo^{u} will please, to lett my Lord Marquis know of his coming, and business; If I had been able now to haue come myselfe with these to Welbeck; I should, (as M^{r} Hobbes also wild mee) haue offerd my seruice, the best I can, about mounting the Longe Tubes, to make them vsefull; For, haueinge ofte obserued, That M^{r} Hobbes, when hee indeauor'd, to shew my Lord of Deuonshire, The Starrs, Saturne and Jupiter, or almost any other farr remote object, with these famous: & longe Tubd perspectiue glasses; hee was alwaies much cumberd & troubled in his attempts, but could neuer attaine to shew my Lord: or himselfe, any thinge, to any purpose, and that meerely, for want of fitting Tubes and frames, which I conceiue must of necessity bee had, before they can bee made vse of; I therefore (observing the defect) did thinke of making fitt Tubes, and frames, with a deuice, to raise and depress them, aptly to any object, And easily and steadily; to direct and fix them with speed; to any visible marke or starr: And I haue fitt materialls ready for such a purpose, and a workman near mee that can by my direccion, effect (no doubte) the thinges I ayme at, If my Lord Marq: shall please to accept of them…

yo^{rs} affectionately to bee Commanded

Humfrey Poole

Hardwick 16 Febr. 1661

> [*addressed*] These For My much respected friend. M[r] Andrew Clayton at Welbeck[36]

This letter indicates that at least some of the telescope-lenses which Newcastle intended to send to London were lenses which had been under Hobbes's care at Chatsworth. And this in turn makes it possible, via a paper-chain of evidence, to identify the telescopes as ones that had originally belonged to Newcastle himself. While he and his brother were in Paris in the 1640s, they assembled a collection of seven telescopes by the finest manufacturers in Europe: one by Francesco Fontana, two by Evangelista Torricelli, and four by Eustachio Divini. Some of these were very large. 'Toricellus his greate Glass' was nearly sixteen feet long, Fontana's was eighteen feet long, and the largest by Divini was described as follows: 'Eustatio Divino, his Greate Glass, for the great Tube, being marked with 37 Palmes and a halfe, is to draw 28 Foote, and 8 Inches, besides foure Inches for the convex Glass, at the Eye'.[37] When Newcastle left Paris in July 1648 he put the collection in Hobbes's hands, while also borrowing 100 pistoles (roughly £92) from him; it was later agreed that Hobbes should keep the telescopes in lieu of repayment of the loan.[38] Somehow Hobbes managed to get these telescopes back to England; most likely it was during this move, for ease of transportation, that the tubes and cases of the largest ones were discarded. When the move occurred is not clear, but it was probably by May 1658, when a Chatsworth account-book recorded payment to a locksmith for work on 'one of the doores of those presses [*sc*. 'the Presses in the Library'] to put perspectiue glasses in'. The same account-book listed several items of expenditure in February 1659

as follows: to a locksmith 'for hookes & pins to draw the Tube frame within y^{e} Library'; 'For 12. square hoopes & 12 spikes for M^{r} Hobbes his devise there'; and 'for the new Tube in the Gyant Chamber to tye M^{r} Hobbes his perspectiue glasses'.[39] A document dated 13 [/23] April 1659 recorded that the 'Prospectiue Glasses' had now been bought from Hobbes; it listed the seven items by Fontana, Torricelli, and Divini, and added: 'Memorandum there are Tubes onely for y^{e} 4. last mentioned glasses'.[40] The purchaser, as another account-book shows, was the earl of Devonshire.[41] And Humfrey Poole's letter to Andrew Clayton suggests, in turn, the reason why the earl may have been willing, a few years later, to give or sell the collection back to its original owner. (That there is a comic element to Poole's account of Hobbes's astronomical efforts is undeniable; but it should not be forgotten that Hobbes was, by this time, seventy-three years old, and had suffered from 'the shaking palsy' – probably Parkinson's disease – for many years.)

Given the timing of Newcastle's letter to Hobbes and Poole's letter to Clayton, it may be surmised that Hobbes had written at more or less the same time to Poole, instructing him to send the telescopes to Welbeck, and to Newcastle, informing him of their imminent arrival, and commenting on the fact that some of them lacked tubes or cases. Newcastle's concern for having 'some cases or tuns [tubes?] made' was probably prompted, therefore, by Hobbes's own comments. By the time Newcastle received the lenses from Poole's son, he would also have known of Poole's offer to supply the cases himself. Whether that offer was accepted is not known; but if Newcastle persisted with his original plan to send these items to London, his letter suggests that Hobbes may, as a

result, have been introduced to Sir Paul Neile, who was not only an acknowledged expert on telescopes, but also one of the central figures in the early Royal Society.[42]

III

A few items have come to light that have been described, incorrectly, as letters to or from Hobbes. They are presented here in chronological order.

(i) An unknown person to Hobbes, 1 September 1623 (about the defeat of 'Alberstat', and with a reference to Polyphemus)

(ii) An unknown person to Hobbes, 27 October 1623 (about the new Pope)

(iii) Hobbes to Sir Gervase Clifton, dated 1630 (about Bassompierre)

These three items are listed in the catalogue of the papers of E. G. Jacoby which are now in the library of the Victoria University of Wellington.[43] However, the first two can be identified as letters from Fulgenzio Micanzio to William Cavendish, the future second earl of Devonshire (letters which survive in translations by Hobbes, but of which he was not the author), and the third is a letter to Sir Gervase Clifton not from Hobbes, but from Clifton's son (also Gervase), whom Hobbes was accompanying on his Grand Tour at the time.[44]

(iv) Hobbes to William Cavendish, first earl (later first marquess, later first duke) of Newcastle, 9 May 1640

A manuscript of such an item, described as a signed autograph letter, was listed in the catalogue of the R. B. Adam collection in 1929.[45] It was subsequently reported (in Kristeller's *Iter Italicum*) to be in the private collection of Mary Hyde, Viscountess Eccles; and it is now in the Houghton Library, Harvard (MS Hyde 10 (337)), where it forms part of the large Hyde bequest.[46] As Hobbes scholars will recognize from its date, however, this text is the dedicatory epistle of Hobbes's manuscript treatise, *The Elements of law*. This manuscript is neither in Hobbes's hand nor signed by him. It is in a scribal hand, identical to that of one of the copies of the treatise now in Chatsworth (MS Hobbes A 2 A); indeed, it must have come from that manuscript, which lacks the dedicatory epistle.[47] Probably this 'letter' was detached by an autograph collector at some time in the nineteenth century, when the manuscript was passing through the market.

(v) Sir William Davenant to Hobbes, from Cowes Castle, Isle of Wight, 1650

In the mid-eighteenth century Theophilus Cibber described, in his account of Davenant's life, the poet's capture at sea by parliamentary forces in May 1650, and his subsequent imprisonment in Cowes Castle. He added: 'Upon this occasion, it is reported of Davenant, that he wrote a letter to Hobbes, in which he gives some account of the progress he made in the third book of Gondibert, and offers some criticisms upon the

nature of that kind of poetry, but why, says he, should I trouble you or myself, with these thoughts, when I am pretty certain I shall be hanged next week.'[48] This very probably arises from a confused reminiscence of the 'Postscript to the Reader' printed at the end of the first edition of *Gondibert*, which is dated '*Cowes Castle in the Isle of* Wight, *October* 22. 1650'. It begins with the statement, 'I Am here arriv'd at the middle of the Third Book, which makes an equal half of the Poem', but then explains that 'I am threatned with Death', and comments: 'even in so worthy a Designe I shall ask leave to desist, when I am interrupted by so great an experiment as Dying'.[49] The rest of the postscript, nevertheless, is taken up with more general comments on heroic poetry, and on the motives for writing it. It thus corresponds to all the features of the 'letter' described by Cibber. While this postscript is not addressed to Hobbes, the 'Preface' to the same volume is; hence, presumably, the confusion.[50]

(vi) and (vii) Hobbes to John Aubrey, 15 October 1675, and John Aubrey to Hobbes, 23 October 1675

These items are contained in a volume of the papers of the nineteenth-century antiquary Canon John E. Jackson, now in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries of London; both are copies in a nineteenth-century hand (not Jackson's own).[51] That the letters are crude forgeries is most easily demonstrated simply by printing the text of the first of them, which is as follows:

To my verie worthie ffriend and Neighbour the Worshipfull John Aubrey Esquier

S[r],

I take the libbertie to inform your honour that being att y[e] age of ffour score yeares I have had my Effigies painted by an eminent Limner in this place soe that when all mie workes are perhaps fforgotten even mie Lleviathan which is now thought to bee my most ffamous worke Posteritie may know somewhat of mie personall appearance att my present age – I trust that itt may chance to fall intoe the handes of some eminent Antiquarie in ffuture times and soe bee the meanes of mie being remembered by those whoe maye succeed us in those darke and evil daies – With my humble duetie I rest worthie Sir

your most sincere and constant ffriend to serve you att all commands

Tho: Hobbes

From my House att Malmesburie this 15.[th] Oct. Annoq: 1675

[*addressed:*] To mie worthie and singular good ffriende the Worshipfull John Aubrey Esquier att his House att Easton Piers nigh to Keynton St. Michaels Wiltes. These p[re]sent[52]

In reply, Aubrey comments that 'I have also bidden Loggan y[e] Graver to make a likeness of mie unworthie self: that thus I alsoe may be remembered by my workes and writings. Liber A. and Liber B. and my countenance to be handed down to future ages in y[e]

Ashmolean Museum where I shall deposit my writings.'

The orthography is characteristic of neither writer, and the anachronisms are glaringly obvious: Hobbes did not live in Malmesbury in 1675, and indeed had not lived there since 1608 at the latest; his 80th birthday was in 1668; Aubrey no longer lived at Easton Piers (his ancestral home), having sold it in 1671; and in 1675 there was no 'Ashmolean Museum'.[53] So crude are these forgeries, indeed, that it must be doubted whether they were intended to deceive anyone; they seem more like something hastily concocted as a *jeu d'esprit*, perhaps to accompany a portrait of Hobbes as it fell 'intoe the handes of some eminent Antiquarie'.[54]

(viii) Sir William Petty to Hobbes (undated)

This item has been described by the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts as follows: 'n.d. No title. Latin letter to Thomas Hobbes on his theory of monarchy. 6 pp.'[55] But it refers to Hobbes throughout in the third person; nor does it have the form of a letter, bearing neither salutation, nor valediction, nor address.[56]

IV

Finally, in the case of two letters which were printed in the Clarendon edition, some details of other manuscript versions of those letters (not mentioned there) can now be added. The letter from Adrian May to Hobbes (dated tentatively to 1647), containing a

disquisition on the nature of sensation, exists also in a transcript in the papers of Thomas Smith in the Bodleian Library.[57] And the letter from Samuel Sorbière to Hobbes of [22 January/] 1 February 1658, containing the rules of the de Montmor 'academy', exists in an English translation by John Evelyn. This translation was made not from the original letter (in French) received by Hobbes, but from the Latin translation which Sorbière himself published in 1660: it is headed, 'A Lettre of Monsieur De Sorbiere to M^{r}: Hobbs, being the Lxxix of his discourses printed at Paris 1660'. It is also endorsed, by Evelyn, 'Translated by Command of our Society: 1661 & read to them'.[58]

---

[1] T. Hobbes, *The Correspondence*, ed. N. Malcolm (2 vols., Oxford, 1994) (= vols. 6 and 7 of the Clarendon Edition of the Works of Thomas Hobbes).

[2] Ibid., I, p. li.

[3] This text, which survives in a copy sent by Payne to Gilbert Sheldon (British Library ('BL'), MS Harl. 6,942, no. 153), was discovered and published by Jeffrey Collins; see his 'Christian ecclesiology and the composition of *Leviathan*: a newly discovered letter to Thomas Hobbes', *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), pp. 217-31. See also J. R. Collins, *The allegiance of Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 140-2. We say 'in effect' here, because Payne was unaware of the preparation of *Leviathan* at that time.

[4] Lambeth Palace Library, MS 2,872, fos. 32-3. See E. G. W. Bill, *A catalogue of manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library, MSS 2341-3119* (London, 1983), p. 97. We are very grateful to the Trustees of Lambeth Palace Library for permission to publish the text of this item, and to Dr Rachel Cosgrave, the Deputy Archivist, for her help. We are also extremely grateful to Dr Arnold Hunt, who not only informed us of this item, but also provided a transcription; in addition, he supplied some of the further information given here about its provenance.

[5] Sotheby's, *Catalogue of a valuable and interesting assemblage of autograph letters ... including the collection of the late Edward Skegg* (London, 1842) (Sotheby's catalogues, University Microfilms edn (Ann Arbor, MI, 1973-6), part 1, reel 56), lot 186. The error here in the date – which should be 'August

30th' – is hard to explain. It is clear, from the contents of the letter and from other evidence, that Barlow was not in frequent correspondence with Hobbes, so it is extremely unlikely that two different letters are involved.

[6] Sotheby's, *Catalogue of the collection of manuscripts formed by the late Mr. William Pickering* (London, 1854), lot 83. The sale was on 12 December 1854.

[7] T. Rodd, *Catalogue of manuscripts & ancient deeds* (London, 1845), item 461.

[8] Henry Stubbe (1632-76), scholar, controversialist, and (later) physician. Between 1657 and 1660 he served as Deputy Keeper of the Bodleian Library, under Barlow. He had made Hobbes's acquaintance in 1655 or early 1656; the surviving letters from Stubbe to Hobbes date from the period April 1656 – October 1659.

[9] Hobbes's *De homine*: see below, n. 14.

[10] The bulk of the book (chapters 2-9, out of a total of 15) is on optics.

[11] Italics here are used for underlining in the MS. This tag comes from a discussion of envy and reputation in Horace, *Epistulae*, II.1, lines 13-14: 'urit enim fulgore suo, qui praegravat artis / infra se positas; exstinctus amabitur idem' ('For the person who outweighs the talents of others inferior to his own burns us with his radiance; once he is extinguished, he too will be loved').

[12] James Wheldon, the third earl of Devonshire's baker at Chatsworth, worked as Hobbes's amanuensis in the final decades of Hobbes's life, and appears to have put Hobbes's papers in order after his death; similar endorsements by him are found on many of Hobbes's letters.

[13] Hobbes, *Correspondence*, I, pp. 420-1. See also Collins, *Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, p. 239.

[14] The Queen's College, Oxford, pressmark FF.g.518: T. Hobbes, *Elementorum philosophiae sectio secunda de homine* (London, 1658). The title page is inscribed, in Barlow's hand, 'Lib: T. Barlow ex dono Authoris'. We are very grateful to Ms Tessa Shaw, the Reader Services Librarian, for her help in making this available.

[15] Ibid., p. 77 ('si religio sit cultus externus, quî fit vt fides sit eius p[ar]s').

[16] Ibid., pp. 77 ('fides Opinio'); 78 ('In supernaturalibus, nulli sine miraculis credendum').

[17] Ibid., p. 78 (the passages, with Barlow's underlined phrases in italics, are as follows: 'Religio itaque Philosophia non est, sed in omni civitate Lex; & propterea non disputanda *est, sed implenda'*; 'Disputantur ea sola quibus unus homo ab alio dissentit; *quae propterea de Fide in Deum non sunt*').

[18] Ibid., p. 79 ('Mors Chr[ist]i non era paena peccatorum nostrorum'). Hobbes's argument was that it was, rather, a sacrifice for our sins.

[19] Ibid., p. 79 (with Barlow's underlining in italics: 'Siquidem enim peccata essent, quanto quis caeteris *hominibus sanctior esset, tanto illi minus credi deberet, ut* minus justo'). The phrase 'splendida peccata', referring to the virtues of the heathen, was commonly attributed to Augustine, but appears to have been coined by Peter Martyr Vermigli: see the 'Query' on this by E. Marshall in *Notes and Queries*, ser. 5, vol. 6 (1876), p. 87.

[20] Details of these, and of the catalogues examined, will be presented in a future article by Mikko Tolonen. He would like to thank Dr Richard Serjeantson for valuable advice and encouragement when he undertook this research.

[21] Sotheby's, *The Bateman heirlooms: catalogue of the collections of engravings & autograph letters formed by the late W. Bateman, esq. & T. Bateman, esq. of Lomberdale House, Youlgrave, Co. Derby* (London, 1893) (Sotheby's catalogues, University Microfilms edn (Ann Arbor, MI, 1973-6), part 2, reel 125), lot 143. The 'portrait' was presumably a separate item, probably an engraving, added by the Batemans.

[22] See M. O'Sullivan, 'Thomas Bateman', in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (60 vols., Oxford, 2004), IV, p. 309.

[23] A manuscript of Hobbes's poem (*De mirabilibus pecci*), now at Chatsworth (MS Hobbes A 1), was formerly in the Batemans' collection, and bears their bookplate.

[24] Hobbes, *Correspondence*, I, pp. 120-1. It may now be added that that letter was sold at Sotheby's on 9 May 1840 (lot 95), for £1 17*s*., to Thorpe.

[25] T. Thorpe, *Catalogue of choice autograph letters* (London, *c*. 1834), item 726; *Upward of one thousand choice autograph letters* (London, 1836), item 451; *A catalogue of an extraordinarily interesting collection of autograph letters* (London, 1838), item 971; *Catalogue for 1840 … autograph letters* (London, 1840), item 799; *Autograph letters* (London, 1843), item 1,841. Copies of these catalogues are held in the

Cambridge University Library ('CUL'): respectively, pressmarks Munby c. 204; Munby c. 209; Munby c. 214; Munby c. 230; Munby c. 235.

[26] The mis-match between the nominative 'Theodorus' and the genitive 'Studiosi' might be explained by supposing that Thorpe had changed the former from the genitive, and had forgotten to change the latter; the text may have ended with some such construction as 'accept the best wishes of …' or 'if you reply you will gladden the heart of…'.

[27] The entry on Thomas Johnson in H. R. Plomer, *A dictionary of the booksellers and printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (London, 1907), pp. 107-8, gives his address as the Key or the Golden Key, St Paul's Churchyard, from 1661 to 1664, but also notes a list of books printed and sold by him in 1658. Presumably Mustert had become a customer at his shop, and was permitted to use it for *poste restante*.

[28] Historisch Genootschap te Groningen, ed., *Album studiosorum Academiae Groninganae* (Groningen, 1915), p. 66.

[29] The professors at Groningen included two well-known critics of Descartes, Samuel Desmarets (Maresius) and Martin Schoock; but an official statement by the university authorities in 1651 about the permissibility of teaching Cartesianism was surprisingly tolerant. See J. Bohatec, *Die cartesianische Scholastik in der Philosophie und reformierten Dogmatik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1912), pp. 47-9, 151-3.

[30] This information about the family was kindly supplied by Dr Rolf Uphoff, Director of the Stadtarchiv, Emden.

[31] Hobbes, *Correspondence*, I, pp. 501-3. As his letter shows, however, Guisony did have some contacts with people who knew Hobbes: Abraham du Prat in Paris, and Henry Stubbe in Oxford.

[32] For the evidence of Hobbes's reply to Guisony see ibid., I, p. 505.

[33] T. Thorpe, *Autographs of illustrious personages* (London, 1833) (CUL, pressmark Munby c. 201), item 306. The orthography here is characteristic of Newcastle: see W. Cavendish, *Dramatic works*, ed. L. Hulse (Oxford, 1996), e.g. pp. 56 ('ther'), 71 ('Whoe'), 102 ('att'), 115 ('Exselente'). Welbeck Abbey, Notts., was the principal seat of the marquess of Newcastle; the word 'tuns' here may perhaps be a misreading of 'tubes' (see below); on Sir Paul Neile see below, n. 42; 'Powell' was John Powell, a servant of Newcastle's

son Henry Cavendish, Viscount Mansfield, the future second duke of Newcastle (1630-91): for a letter of 2 [/12] November 1661 from John Powell in London to Newcastle's steward at Welbeck, see Nottingham University Library ('NUL'), MS Pw 1/485.

[34] T. Thorpe, *Catalogue of royal, noble, and literary autograph letters* (London, 1837) (CUL, pressmark Munby c. 213), item 1035.

[35] See Hobbes, *Correspondence*, II, pp. 524, 801-5, 811-15. That Newcastle continued to take an interest in Hobbes's work is, however, suggested by the catalogue of the collection which included Newcastle's library: this contains *Humane nature* (1650), *Leviathan* in English (1651) and Latin (1670), *De corpore* in Latin (1655) and English (1656), the translation of the *Odyssey* (1675), *De mirabilibus pecci* (1678), and *Decameron physiologicum* (1678): N. Noel, *Bibliotheca nobilissimi principis Johannis ducis de Novo-Castro* (London, 1719), 1st pagination, pp. 15, 18; 2nd pagination, pp. 41, 42, 58, 63.

[36] NUL, MS Pw 1/484; we are very grateful to Manuscripts and Special Collections, the University of Nottingham for permission to publish this, and to Mrs Linda Shaw for her help. The reference to Saturn here may perhaps reflect Hobbes's interest in the discoveries of Christiaan Huygens concerning Saturn's moon Titan (announced in 1655 in *De saturni luna observatio*, of which Hobbes received a manuscript copy in 1656: see Hobbes, *Correspondence*, I, pp. 275-6), and concerning Saturn's ring (announced in 1659 in *Systema saturnium*). The reference to Jupiter, similarly, may indicate a desire to repeat Galileo's famous observations of the moons of Jupiter or 'Medicean stars'.

[37] NUL, MS Pw 1/668. Most of these telescopes had probably been acquired in Italy by Sir Kenelm Digby: see N. Malcolm and J. A. Stedall, *John Pell (1611-1685) and his correspondence with Sir Charles Cavendish: the mental world of an early modern mathematician* (Oxford, 2005), p. 503 n.

[38] NUL, MS Pw 1/406.

[39] Chatsworth, MS Hardwick 34, entries for 11 May 1658; 12 and 24 February 1658 [/1659].

[40] Chatsworth, MS Hobbes E 3. The ones lacking tubes were the three longest, described here as follows: one by Divini ('for a Tube of 37 Palmes'), the one by Fontana ('for a Tube of 22 Palmes'), and one by Torricelli ('for a Tube of 21 palmes'). We are very grateful to Andrew Peppitt, Archivist at Chatsworth, for his help in supplying a copy of this document.

[41] Chatsworth, MS Hardwick 33, entry for 16 April 1658 [/1659]: 'To M[r] Hobbes for Prospective glasses £80'.

[42] See C. A. Ronan and H. Hartley, 'Sir Paul Neile, F.R.S. (1613-1686)', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 15 (1960), pp. 159-65; A. D. C. Simpson, 'Sir Paul Neile', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, XL, pp. 356-7.

[43] The catalogue consulted here, entitled 'E. G. Jacoby research papers', is held with the Ferdinand Tönnies papers in the Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesbibliothek, Kiel. Jacoby, a pupil of Tönnies, edited a collection of Tönnies's writings on Hobbes and Spinoza (*Studien zur Philosophie und Gesellschaft im 17. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1975)), and appended to it a detailed listing of Hobbes's known correspondence (pp. 361-75: 'Epistolarium hobbesianum').

[44] For the first two see F. Micanzio, *Lettere a William Cavendish*, ed. R. Ferrini (Rome, 1987), pp. 251-3, 255-7; the third is NUL, MS Clifton C 559 (of which Jacoby's MS 5/230 is a transcript). We are very grateful to Nicola Frean, of the J. C. Beaglehole Room, Victoria University of Wellington Central Library, for her help in providing copies of Jacoby items.

[45] *The R. B. Adam library relating to Dr. Samuel Johnson and his era* (4 vols., London, New York, and Buffalo, NY, 1929-30), III, pp. 128-9.

[46] P. Kristeller, ed., *Iter italicum* (7 vols., London, Leiden, 1962-97), V, p. 401.

[47] We are very grateful to Susan Halpert, of the Houghton Library, and Andrew Peppitt, Archivist at Chatsworth, for supplying photographs and measurements of these items. The handwriting matches exactly; there is a very small discrepancy in the page-sizes, but this could be explained by supposing that the leaf containing the dedicatory epistle was, after its removal, cut down slightly to fit an album. It seems likely that the Chatsworth MS was acquired in the nineteenth century, by which time the epistle may already have been removed.

[48] T. Cibber (et al.), *The lives of the poets of Great Britain and Ireland* (5 vols., London, 1753), II, p. 73.

[49] Sir William Davenant, *Gondibert: an heroick poem* (London, 1651), sig. Kkk1r-v.

[50] We are very grateful to Prof. Timothy Raylor for his comments on this matter.

[51] Society of Antiquaries of London, MS 817/9 (Jackson Collection, File: Malmesbury-Purton), fo. 25. We are very grateful to Prof. John Milton for bringing these items to our attention.

[52] We are very grateful to the Society of Antiquaries of London for permission to publish this, and to Adrian James, the Assistant Librarian, for his help.

[53] In 1675 Elias Ashmole had only just begun to negotiate with Oxford University about the transfer of his collections; work began on building the museum in 1679, and it was opened to the public in 1683.

[54] On a nearby page in Jackson's notes (MS 817/9, fo. 29v) is a small advertisement cut from a newspaper: 'For sale, a beautiful, life-size oil painting of the celebrated Thomas Hobbs of Malmesbury. The picture is by one of the old masters, and has been painted several hundred years, and has been greatly admired by all who have seen it. It is at present the property of Mr. J. E. Wigmore, of Nailsworth, and is entrusted to the care of Mr. Bassett, of the George Hotel, Malmesbury, who will be pleased to show it upon application.' This is annotated: 'July 1879. Bought by J. E. Jackson from Mr Wigmore of Nailsworth, Aug. 2 1879. A good copy. But some error in the date on it?' However, on the back of the advertisement, Jackson has written: 'On the portrait I bought are the figures MDCLXV W: fec AETATIS SUAE LXXXV But Hobbes was born 5 April 1588 ... so that in 1665 he was only 77 years old'; this matches neither the date '1675', nor the reference to Hobbes's 80th year.

[55] Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Report on the literary, personal and official correspondence and papers of Sir William Petty (1623-1687)* (2 vols., London, 1980), I, p. 289.

[56] This item is now BL MS Add. 72,898, fos. 89-105. It is printed in Sir William Petty, *The Petty papers: some unpublished writings*, ed. the marquis of Lansdowne (2 vols., London, 1927), II, pp. 35-9; an English translation is given in F. Amati and T. Aspromourgos, 'Petty *contra* Hobbes: a previously untranslated manuscript', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 46 (1985), pp. 127-32. The modern catalogue gives a more accurate description, and offers the dating '1660s?': *The British Library catalogue of additions to the manuscripts: the Petty papers* [ed. F. Smith] (London, 2000), p. 112. We are very grateful to Dr Kinch Hoekstra for bringing this item to our attention.

[57] Hobbes, *Correspondence*, I, pp. 148-50; Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Smith 27, pp. 13-14. This is the scholar, orientalist, and non-juror Thomas Smith (1638-1710); the source from which he obtained the text is not apparent. We are very grateful to Prof. Timothy Raylor for bringing this item to our attention.

[58] Hobbes, *Correspondence*, I, pp. 491-3. This manuscript, in Evelyn's hand, is printed in full in Anon., *The Carl H. Pforzheimer library: English literature, 1475-1700* (3 vols., New York, 1940), III, pp. 1205-8. It is

now in the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin (MS 35a-351). We are very grateful to Prof. Mordechai Feingold for bringing this item to our attention. Unfortunately, as the compiler of the Pforzheimer catalogue notes, there is no mention of the 'Command' to Evelyn, nor of his reading, in any of the records or early histories of the Royal Society. Prof. Feingold suggests that these events probably took place in May-June 1661, in connection with the report to the Royal Society by Samuel Tuke on his recent visit to the de Montmor academy (see T. Birch, *The history of the Royal Society of London* (4 vols., London, 1756-7), I, pp. 23, 26-8).