

The Inaugural Martin Hollis Memorial Lecture

Hobbes and the Purely Artificial Person of the State

QUENTIN SKINNER

History, University of Cambridge

I

You do not need to be a person of religious faith to feel that Martin is with us here today.¹ I am sure that all of us who knew him personally are thinking about him; and I know that many of us have also been thinking anew in recent months about the large and important body of philosophical work he left behind. He remains, in short, a presence, even though it is tragically true that in another and far more important sense his presence is what we all miss.

Although Martin's corpus of writing was large, it was strongly unified by one overriding set of interests. Almost everything he published was concerned with persons and their reasons for action. Perhaps the best-known of his philosophical beliefs was that the idea of rational action must never be explicated simply in terms of desires, since we need to take account of the ends for the sake of which people act and the value of those ends.² Anyone wishing to honour Martin and his achievement must surely focus on those themes.

For me, however, this requirement poses an obvious difficulty. It is a tribute to the breadth of Martin's intellectual sympathies that he and I engaged in many academic debates.³ But the fact remains that I am not a philosopher, merely an historian of philosophy. More specifically, I am a student of Hobbes, a thinker about whom Martin never wrote. Worse still, if Martin ever had written about Hobbes he would surely have done so in tones of the sternest disapproval. For it was Hobbes who inspired Hume's classic argument to the effect that our actions must always be explained basically by reference to our desires,⁴ the very

EDITOR'S NOTE: This lecture commemorates the life and work of Martin Hollis, who passed away aged 59 on 27 February 1998. Our world is much the poorer without him.

¹This lecture was delivered at the University of East Anglia on 5 May 1998. For reading drafts I am deeply indebted to Annabel Brett, Kinch Hoekstra, Susan James, David Johnston and Karl Schuhmann, all of whom have given me exceptionally helpful comments which I have done my best to incorporate.

²See especially Hollis 1987 and the essays collected in Hollis 1996.

³See Hollis 1975; Hollis and Skinner 1978; Skinner 1988, esp. pp. 246–55. The debate we conducted at the British Academy on 30 January 1997 under the title 'Philosophy and its History' was, I subsequently learned, the last academic event to which Martin was able to contribute.

⁴Russell 1985 discusses Hume's dependence on Hobbes. James 1997, esp. pp. 255–68 traces the movement towards the view that, in order to explain actions, we merely need to focus on beliefs and desires, and examines the more complex background out of which this Humean commitment arose.

contention that Martin spent so much of his career attempting to undermine.

I could of course carry on regardless of this difficulty, except that I cannot help remembering one particular telephone call I once received from Martin. He had called inviting me to give a lecture to his students at the University of East Anglia. I responded by asking what themes they had been discussing, and suggested that I might say something further about one of the topics they had already covered. 'I think', Martin replied 'that it might be better if you were to lecture on something you know about'.

With that advice echoing in my ears, what can I do but turn to Hobbes? It is fortunate, however, that in doing so I shall by no means be turning away from the topic that Martin made so much his own, that of persons and their reasons for action. For while Hobbes is primarily remembered as a theorist of the state, the essence of his theory is that the state is the name of a particular type of person. Furthermore, the state is the person whose reasons and actions we have the greatest cause to worry about, since the state is the holder of sovereign power over us all.

To speak of the sovereign state, however, is to allude to one of the most puzzling dilemmas in our inherited theories of government. On the one hand, most contemporary political philosophers would agree with Hobbes that the state is the holder of sovereignty.⁵ As Hobbes expresses the claim in *Leviathan*, it is 'the Reason of this our Artificiall Man the Common-wealth, and his Command, that maketh Law', so that civil law is nothing other than 'the Will and Appetite of the State'.⁶ But on the other hand, most contemporary philosophers would also agree that the state amounts to nothing more than an artifice. To quote Hobbes again, the state has no capacity 'to doe any thing'; it is 'but a word, without substance, and cannot stand'.⁷ There, then, is the puzzle. How can the state, an apparent abstraction, nevertheless be the name of the person who makes laws, punishes criminals, declares war and peace, and performs all the other actions necessary for maintaining—in Hobbes's fine phrase—the safety of the people and their other contentments of life?⁸

One reason for wishing to focus on Hobbes's answer to this question is essentially historical. Hobbes was the first major philosopher to organise a theory of government around the person of the state. As he says himself, 'I speak not of the men, but (in the Abstract) of the Seat of Power', to which he adds that the seat is 'that great Leviathan called a Common-wealth, or State'.⁹ What drove him in this direction? What prompted him to develop the intricate conceptual machinery needed to articulate the idea of the sovereign state? These questions have seldom

⁵For some recent examples see the contributions to Biersteker and Weber 1996.

⁶Hobbes 1996, pp. 187, 469.

⁷Ibid., pp. 184, 245.

⁸Ibid., p. 231.

⁹Ibid., pp. 3, 9.

been raised, but I hope to end by offering something in the nature of an answer to them.

A second reason for focusing on Hobbes is more strictly exegetical. He informs us in Chapter XVI of *Leviathan* that the state can actually be defined as ‘One Person’.¹⁰ But it is far from clear what he means by this, and even less clear what he means by adding that the person of the state is also the seat of power. Nor have these problems been very satisfactorily addressed in much of the critical literature. It is remarkable how many surveys of Hobbes’s thought—even the best recent surveys¹¹—glide past these issues in silence. The exegetical task is accordingly that of trying to say something further about the meaning of Hobbes’s claims about the person of the state.

My principal reason for concentrating on Hobbes, however, is a more philosophical one, and here at least I feel sure that Martin would have approved. As I have observed, we continue to organise our public life around the idea of the sovereign state. But it seems to me that we do not always understand the theory we have inherited, and that arguably we have never managed fully to make sense of the proposition that the person of the state is the seat of sovereignty. This encourages me to hope that an historical investigation of Hobbes’s argument may turn out to be of far more than purely historical interest.

II

Hobbes eventually worked out a distinctive and highly influential approach to the question of how it is possible for a state—or any other abstraction or collectivity—to perform actions and take responsibility for the consequences. The explanation, he proposed, depends on making sense of what he describes as the class of attributed actions. What we need to understand is how actions can be validly attributed to agents, and genuinely counted as theirs, even when the agent in question did not in fact perform the action, and perhaps could not in principle have performed it.

Hobbes gives the answer without preamble in Chapter XVI of *Leviathan*, the chapter entitled *Of Persons, Authors and Things Personated*. His proposed solution (already implicit in his title) is impressively if deceptively straightforward. It is possible, he argues, for an action genuinely to be attributed to a collectivity—or to an abstraction or even a thing—provided that one particular condition is met. The agent to whom the action is attributed

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 121.

¹¹For example, Tuck 1989, Flathman 1993, Martinich 1997. But this lack of interest is especially marked in the Anglophone literature. By contrast, the French literature in particular has included a number of important studies of the *personne* of the state. See, for example, Polin 1981; Tricaud 1982; Jaume 1986; Lessay 1992; Zarka 1995. For a valuable recent discussion in English see Sommerville 1992, pp. 57–63.

must be represented by another agent who can validly claim to be ‘personating’ the first by way of acting on their behalf.¹²

The inspiration for this approach—along with so much else in the conceptual apparatus of *Leviathan*—appears to be drawn from the *Digest* of Roman Law.¹³ Book XIV of the *Digest* opens by considering the implications of the fact that owners of various kinds of property—specifically, owners of ships and shops—can appoint other persons to serve as their captains or managers.¹⁴ The law describes a number of circumstances in which you may be liable for the consequences of whatever actions are performed on your behalf when you agree *praepondere*—that is, to appoint someone to serve as your agent.¹⁵ Although you will not have performed the actions yourself, you will be legally obliged *praestare*—that is, to stand by the actions and accept responsibility for them as your own.¹⁶

There are several indications in Hobbes’s early works that—in common with other constitutional theorists of the 1640s¹⁷—he was aware of this theory and interested in developing it.¹⁸ In his first treatise on civil science, *The Elements of Law*, the manuscript of which he circulated in 1640, he already isolates the category of ‘civil persons’¹⁹ and asks how ‘a multitude of persons natural’ can become ‘united by covenants into one person civil’.²⁰ And in the earliest published version of his political theory, the *Elementarum philosophiae sectio*

¹²Pitkin 1967 rightly stresses that representation is the basic concept. Although I disagree with Pitkin at several points, I am greatly indebted to her classic analysis.

¹³Brett 1997, pp. 205–35 examines the place of this legal tradition in Hobbes’s thought. See also Lessay 1992, pp. 167–79 on Hobbes’s invocations of the Roman law of corporations.

¹⁴Mommsen and Krueger 1985, XIV.1.1 and XIV.3.1, pp. 415, 422. Johnston 1995, esp. pp. 1517–24 discusses these passages and their implications for legal liability.

¹⁵Mommsen and Krueger 1985, XIV.1.5, p. 415 and XIV.3.5, p. 422: even if I have put someone else in charge (*praeposui*), I may still be liable in full (*in solidum teneri*).

¹⁶Mommsen and Krueger 1985, XIV.1.5, p. 415: ‘debeo praestare qui eum praeposui’—‘I ought to stand by the actions of the person I have appointed’.

¹⁷Among parliamentary writers, Parker 1642, p. 193 speaks of the need for ‘Authors’ to take responsibility for their ‘Actors’; among royalists, Digges 1642, p. 22 claims that acts performed by judges are in effect performed by the king, since ‘they sustaine his person’. See Sanderson 1989, p. 73 for the attribution of this tract to Digges.

¹⁸The earliest of these intimations can be found in *A Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique*, a manual published anonymously in c. 1637 but invariably attributed to Hobbes. See Hobbes 1986, Book I, Chapter 14, p. 61, where he speaks of the need to know ‘what a *publique Person*, or the *City* is; and what a *private Person*, or *Citizen* is’. The *Briefe* is basically an English rendering of a Latin paraphrase of Aristotle’s *Art of Rhetoric*, a paraphrase that definitely appears to be Hobbes’s work. (It is preserved at Chatsworth as *Hobbes MS D.1: Latin Exercises*; it appears to have been dictated by Hobbes to his pupil, the third Earl of Devonshire, and is in the hand of the third Earl, with additions and corrections by Hobbes.) Hobbes’s paraphrase is in turn drawn from the Latin translation of Aristotle’s *Art of Rhetoric* published by Theodore Goulston in 1619 alongside his edition of the Greek text (See Goulston 1619.) But the passage from chapter 14 is one of many that might lead one to doubt whether the *Briefe* is Hobbes’s work. There is nothing in Goulston’s text or Hobbes’s paraphrase corresponding to the *Briefe*’s suggestion that a city can be described as ‘a *publique Person*’, and elsewhere in his early works Hobbes always prefers to speak of ‘civil’ persons. I owe this point to Karl Schuhmann, who has persuaded me that the *Briefe* is almost certainly not by Hobbes.

¹⁹Hobbes 1969, pp. 108, 117. Later Hobbes adds (1969, p. 174) that, ‘though in the charters of subordinate corporations, a corporation be declared to be one person in law, yet the same hath not been taken note of in the body of a commonwealth or city’.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 108.

tertia de cive of 1642, he examines the same question at greater length,²¹ defining a city or *civitas* as a *persona civilis* ‘whose *will*, from the covenants of many men, is to be taken for the *will* of them all’.²²

At the same time, Hobbes begins to raise the question of how it is possible for actions to be attributed to civil persons of this kind. In *The Elements* he asks how ‘any action done in a multitude’ can be ‘attributed to the multitude, or truly called the action of the multitude’.²³ And in *De Cive* he begins to supply an answer. He introduces a distinction in chapter VII between a *populus* considered as a collectivity and ‘a disunited multitude to whom it is not possible for any *action* or any *right* to be attributed’.²⁴ The implication, duly pursued in chapter XII, is that a united body of people, by contrast with a mere multitude, may be capable of acting as a single person in the sense that ‘it is possible for *one single* action to be attributed to it’.²⁵

The weakness of these discussions is that they lack any account of how such attributions are to be made, and of how to distinguish between genuine attributions and those which may be counterfeited. It is only in the *Leviathan* of 1651 that these questions are properly addressed and a theory of attributed action systematically laid out. This initial effort, however, was marred by some obscurity and even incoherence. Hobbes later recognised these defects himself, and took the chance to introduce a number of improvements when he published *De Homine* in 1658, in which he devoted his closing chapter to the theme of *De homine fictitio*. Still later he introduced yet further refinements when he revised *Leviathan* and reissued it in Latin in 1668. While it will be best to begin with the English *Leviathan* of 1651, it will be necessary at various points to take account of these corrections and embellishments.

Hobbes introduces his attempt to analyse attributed action in terms of representation at the start of Chapter XVI of *Leviathan*,²⁶ where he begins by unveiling his definition of the underlying concept of a person:

A PERSON, is he, *whose words or actions are considered, either as his own, or as representing the words or actions of an other man, or of any other thing to whom they are attributed, whether Truly or by Fiction.*²⁷

To construe: a general theory of action will not only have to explain how individual persons can represent themselves, so that their words and actions can truly be attributed to them; such a theory will also have to explain how it is

²¹Hobbes 1983, V.IX–X, p. 134 and VI.I, p. 136 describes the *civitas* as a *persona civilis*.

²²Ibid., V.IX, p. 134: ‘*cuius voluntas, ex pactis plurium hominum, pro voluntate habenda est ipsorum omnium*’.

²³Hobbes 1969, p. 108.

²⁴Hobbes 1983, VII. V, p. 153: ‘*multitudo dissoluta cui nulla neque actio neque ius attribui potest.*’ Cf. Hobbes 1983, VI. I, p. 136 on why it is impossible for an action to be attributed to a multitude.

²⁵Ibid., XII. VIII, p. 190: ‘*cui actio una attribui possit.*’

²⁶Although Hobbes had already introduced the concept in Chapter XV when discussing the attribution of justice and injustice to actions and to men. See Hobbes 1996, pp. 103–4.

²⁷Hobbes 1996, p. 111.

possible for one person to represent someone else—or some *thing* else—in such a way that the words or actions of the representative can validly be attributed to the person (or thing) being represented. To put the point in a different way—as Hobbes does later in the chapter—a general theory of action will need to include an account of how it is possible for one person to act in the name of someone else. This is because ‘to *Personate*, is to *Act* or *Represent* himselfe, or an other; and he that acteth another, is said to beare his Person, or act in his name’.²⁸

These phrases about ‘personating’ and ‘bearing’ other persons fall strangely on modern ears, so it is worth recalling that Hobbes’s usages were not at all unusual at the time. It has lately been suggested that the peculiarities of his terminology stem from the fact that he was drawing on the vocabulary of covenanting theology.²⁹ But as Hobbes himself emphasised, his terminology was in fact taken from the theatre.³⁰ By the time he was writing, the idea of ‘bearing’ or ‘presenting’ *dramatis personae* on the stage had become sufficiently familiar to be understood even by such unsophisticated thespians as the tradesmen in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Rehearsing the story of Pyramus and Thisbe, they find themselves beset by various problems of mimesis. One is how to convey the fact that the lovers met by moonlight. They decide that someone will have to enter ‘with a bush of thorns and a lantern and say he comes to disfigure, or to present, the person of Moonshine’.³¹ A further problem is that the lovers spoke through a chink in a wall, and that it will not be possible to bring a wall on stage. Again they agree that ‘some man or other must present Wall’,³² and when they later perform their play the wall is duly personated by the tinker Snout.³³

The anxiety of Shakespeare’s rustics to demonstrate their mastery of theatrical terminology is of course part of the comedy. But the passage reminds us that, in drawing on the same terminology in *Leviathan*, Hobbes was merely ‘translating’, as he put it, a range of concepts long familiar in the playhouse to encompass ‘any Representer of speech and action, as well in Tribunalls, as Theaters’.³⁴ The outcome, as he adds, is that in his theory ‘a *Person*, is the same that an *Actor* is, both on the Stage and in common Conversation’.³⁵

The term *attributed* was likewise a familiar piece of legal terminology, and was evidently chosen by Hobbes with some care. The Latin verb *attribuere* had always been used to convey the sense that something should be counted as belonging to someone. Furthermore, there was always the implication—as in the case of attributing an anonymous text to its rightful author—that the responsibility for a work may sometimes be hard to assign, and that

²⁸Ibid., p. 112.

²⁹See Martinich 1992, pp. 165, 384 and references there.

³⁰Pye 1984 and Runciman 1997, pp. 224–9 discuss the place of theatricality in Hobbes’s account of persons and states.

³¹Shakespeare 1988, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, III. i. 54–6, p. 320.

³²Ibid., III. i. 62, p. 320.

³³Ibid., V. i. 154–5, 160–1, p. 330.

³⁴Hobbes 1996, p. 112.

³⁵Ibid., p. 112.

appearances may often deceive. These considerations had already been highlighted by the ancient theories of forensic eloquence. They had made it a principle that, whenever the wording of a text is in question in a court of law, you must seek to cast doubt on whatever attributions of meaning and authorship have been made by your adversaries.³⁶ The parallel with attributed action is close: while it may be evident who performed the action, it may not be evident who should count as its true author, and hence as responsible for its consequences. And these were exactly the parallels that Hobbes was concerned to bring out.

With the introduction of the key concept of an attributed action, Hobbes comes face to face with the principal problem he needs to address. What is to count as the valid representation of one person's words or actions by someone else, such that it will be proper to say of an action performed by a representative that it ought to be attributed to the person—or thing or collectivity—being represented? What, in a word, distinguishes representation from misrepresentation?

Hobbes grappled with this problem in every recension of his civil science, but it was only in *Leviathan* that he arrived at a satisfactory answer, or indeed any answer at all. Once again his solution wears an air of remarkable simplicity, but it constitutes one of the most important theoretical advances he made between the publication of *De Cive* in 1642 and *Leviathan* nearly a decade later, and arguably embodies his most original contribution to the theory of the state.³⁷ His suggestion is that an action can be validly attributed to one person on the basis of its performance by a representative if and only if the representative has in some way been duly authorised,³⁸ and hence instructed and commissioned, to perform the action concerned.³⁹ The crucial concept is accordingly that of authorisation⁴⁰ and, more specifically, that of being an author and hence in a position to grant authority. These terms make no appearance in *The Elements* or *De Cive*, but in *Leviathan* they furnish the entire theoretical grounding for Hobbes's account of the legitimate state.⁴¹

The terminology of authors and authorisation is introduced at an early stage in Chapter XVI of *Leviathan*. Hobbes first employs these terms when considering

³⁶See, for example, Caplan 1954, II. IX. 13, p. 80 on how a *sententia* should be *adtributa*.

³⁷As is rightly stressed in Gauthier 1969, p. 120 and Zarka 1995, p. 197.

³⁸Note that 'duly' need not mean 'explicitly': implicit authorisation is a possibility for Hobbes.

³⁹Hobbes does not say that the representative has to be authorised by the person being represented. As we shall see in Section III, he needs to leave space for the fact that this will sometimes be impossible in principle.

⁴⁰Hobbes 1996, pp. 120, 151 explicitly invokes this terminology. On Hobbes's concept of authorisation see Copp 1980, pp. 582–95, a discussion to which I am particularly indebted.

⁴¹My discussion is mainly confined to the basic case in which one natural person or body of persons directly authorises another to act either on their behalf or on behalf of a third party. Hobbes introduces many refinements which I have no space to consider here: conditional authorisation (Hobbes 1996, p. 115); authorisation of assemblies (Hobbes 1996, p. 129); and authorisation not by mutual covenant but by covenant with a conqueror (Hobbes 1996, p. 141). A full analysis of Hobbes's theory would need to take account of these refinements, but in the meantime there are several good reasons for concentrating on the basic case. One is that Hobbes does so himself. Another is that he is not always successful at explaining how the refinements fit on to the basic case. As we shall see, one consequence is that sometimes there is insufficient textual basis for discussing them.

the sense in which we can speak of actions, by analogy with possessions, as ‘owned’ by particular individuals:

Then the Person is the *Actor*; and he that owneth his words and actions, is the *AUTHOR*: In which case the Actor acteth by Authority. For that which in speaking of goods and possessions, is called an *Owner*, and in latine *Dominus*, in Greeke κύριος, speaking of Actions, is called an Author.⁴²

Hobbes is asking what allows an actor—that is, a representative—to claim that he is acting by authority. (I shall sometimes be obliged to follow him in writing as if all such actors are male.) The representative needs to be able to claim that he was duly authorised, in which case the person who granted him authority will count as the author of his action and will have to take responsibility for its consequences. The conclusion is guaranteed by the two stipulations underpinning Hobbes’s argument. The first states that anyone who authorises an action can be identified as its author. The second adds that, when we speak about the authors of actions, we are equivalently speaking about their owners, since we are speaking about those who must ‘own up’ to whatever is done in their name.⁴³

A dramatic implication underlies this analysis, as Hobbes immediately points out:

From hence it followeth, that when the Actor maketh a Covenant by Authority, he bindeth thereby the Author, no lesse than if he had made it himselfe; and no less subjecteth him to all the consequences of the same.⁴⁴

The implication is brought out still more forthrightly in *De Homine*: ‘He is called an author who has declared that he wishes an action to be held as his own which another person has performed’.⁴⁵ Hobbes is now prepared unequivocally to state that the reason why authors must ‘own up’ to the actions they have authorised is that the actions in question will be theirs, not those of anyone else.

The significance of the implication is that it yields the required criterion for judging when an alleged author can validly claim to have been misrepresented. If you are impersonated by a purported representative without having antecedently granted him authority, you are under no obligation to ‘own’ his actions, since you cannot be said to have authorised their performance. It is only ‘when the Authority is evident’ that the author is obliged; if, by contrast, ‘the Authority is feigned, it obligeth the Actor onely; there being no Author but himselfe.’⁴⁶

To round off his exposition, Hobbes provides an account of the mechanism by which it is possible for one person to receive the kind of authority that enables them validly to represent another and act in their name. He gives his

⁴²Hobbes 1996, p. 112.

⁴³I am indebted to the discussion in Pitkin 1967, pp. 18–19 on owning and ‘owning up’.

⁴⁴Hobbes 1996, p. 112.

⁴⁵Hobbes 1839, XV. 2, p. 131: ‘*Author enim vocatur is, qui actionem quam facit alius pro sua habere se velle declaravit*’.

⁴⁶Hobbes 1996, p. 113.

explanation—again by analogy with the ownership of goods—in the same passage of Chapter XVI:

And as the Right of possession, is called Dominion; so the Right of doing any action, is called AUTHORITY and sometimes *warrant*. So that by Authority, is always understood a Right of doing any act; and *done by Authority*, done by Commission, or License from him whose right it is.⁴⁷

To construe again: to be able to act by authority is to have been granted a commission or license to perform an action by some person or persons who must possess the right to perform it themselves. The grant must take the form of a voluntary transfer of right, since commissioning and licensing are names of voluntary acts. So the receipt of such a commission must be equivalent to the acquisition of the transferred right of performing the action involved.⁴⁸ Hobbes later summarises more clearly in *De Homine*. ‘They are said to have authority who do something by the right of someone else’,⁴⁹ so that ‘unless he who is the author himself possesses the right of acting, the actor has no authority to act’.⁵⁰

By signalling acceptance of such a covenant,⁵¹ the authorising agent acquires two contrasting obligations towards his representative. One is the duty to take responsibility for his actions. But the other is a duty of non-interference. This follows from the fact that, whenever an authorising agent voluntarily transfers the right to perform an action, he thereby gives up the right to perform it himself. As Hobbes explains, ‘To *lay downe* a mans Right to any thing, is to *devest* himselfe of the *Liberty*, of hindring another of the benefit of his own Right to the same’.⁵² He goes on to trace the implications in his most minatory tones:

When a man hath in either manner abandoned, or granted away his Right; then is he said to be OBLIGED, or BOUND, not to hinder those, to whom such Right is granted, or abandoned, from the benefit of it: and that he *Ought*, and it is his DUTY, not to make voyd that voluntary act of his own: and that such hindrance is INJUSTICE, and INJURY, as being *Sine Jure*; the Right being before renounced, or transferred.⁵³

Once you have covenanted, you must leave it to your representative, who is now in possession of your right of action, to exercise it at his discretion when acting in your name.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁴⁸This is worth underlining, if only because it has sometimes been argued that (as Gauthier 1969, p. 124 puts it) although the act of authorisation seems to involve ‘some translation of right’, this is ‘evidently not mere renunciation, nor is it transfer, in Hobbes’s usual sense’.

⁴⁹Hobbes 1839, XV. 2, p. 131: ‘Itaque auctoritatem habere dicuntur, qui quid iure faciunt alieno’.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, ‘Nisi enim is, qui autor est, ius habet agendi ipse, actor agendi auctoritatem non habet’.

⁵¹Note that this is the form of the covenant only in what I am calling the basic case—what Hobbes (1996, p. 115) calls the case of being ‘simply’ as opposed to ‘conditionally’ authorised. Leyden 1982, pp. 89–95 discusses the special complexities attaching to conditional authorisation.

⁵²Hobbes 1996, p. 92.

⁵³*Ibid.*, pp. 92–3.

Before considering how Hobbes applies his general theory, we need to examine one allegedly knock-down objection to his entire line of thought.⁵⁴ One commentator who has recently pressed the objection has been Joel Feinberg, who has raised it in discussing Hobbes's example of a master who 'commandeth his servant to give mony to a stranger'.⁵⁵ The servant is acting as his master's representative, from which it follows, according to Hobbes, that the act of paying the stranger must be attributed to the master.⁵⁶ But according to Feinberg this analysis is dangerously misleading. Although the 'pecuniary consequences' may be the same as if the master had acted himself, 'it is nevertheless true that *he* did not act'; what we have to say is that his servant acted for him.⁵⁷ The objection is thus that attributed actions are not actions.

One possible retort⁵⁸ would be to insist that, in spite of the obvious difference between attributed actions and actions performed at first hand, the two ought nevertheless to be classified together on the grounds of their numerous family resemblances.⁵⁹ But Hobbes makes no attempt to mount this kind of defence, and he surely stands in no need of it. It is true that he likes to speak of attributed actions as if they are genuine instances of action. But it is sufficient for his purposes to defend the much less controversial claim he puts forward about 'ownership': the claim that, when someone acts as an accredited representative, the person being represented must 'own' the consequences of the action as if they had performed it themselves. The action counts as theirs, and is called their action,⁶⁰ not because they actually perform it, but because they are under an obligation to take responsibility for its occurrence.⁶¹

⁵⁴Copp 1980, pp. 585–6 offers a more specific objection. I can validly be held accountable for an action performed by someone else if I coerce them into performing it. But coercing is not authorising; so I can validly be held accountable, *pace* Hobbes, for actions I have not authorised. Hobbes would not regard this as an objection. For him, coercion and freedom of action are compatible, so that even coercive acts of authorisation genuinely authorise. See Skinner 1990 for this aspect of Hobbes's theory of freedom.

⁵⁵Hobbes 1996, p. 104; cf. Feinberg 1970, p. 227.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 112, 113; cf. also p. 156.

⁵⁷Feinberg 1970, p. 227.

⁵⁸Copp 1979, pp. 177–8 suggests another possible retort: that the question of what it may be misleading to say in the case of the master and his servant depends on what is in question about the episode. Suppose that, although the servant duly hands over the money, a question later arises as to whether the stranger has been paid. What it will be misleading to say in these circumstances is that the master has not paid the stranger. He *has* paid him—by commanding and thereby causing his servant to make the payment.

⁵⁹Copp 1980, pp. 581–2 discusses Feinberg's objection to Hobbes's analysis and proposes this response.

⁶⁰As in *Catiline his Conspiracy* by Ben Jonson (a friend of Hobbes's). See Jonson 1937, III. 38–9, p. 469, where Cicero, on his election as Consul, is made to declare:

'For every lapse of mine will, now, be call'd
Your error, if I make such . . .'

⁶¹Runciman 1997, p. 7. I am much indebted to Runciman's analysis at this point.

III

I have now laid out what I take to be the basic elements in Hobbes's theory of attributed action. But the plot is thicker than I have so far intimated. When Hobbes introduces his theory, he specifies that two distinct types of person are capable of performing attributed actions: natural persons and feigned or artificial persons:

A PERSON, is he, *whose words or actions are considered, either as his own, or as representing the words or actions of an other man, or of any other thing to whom they are attributed, whether Truly or by Fiction.*

When they are considered as his owne, then is he called a *Naturall Person*: And when they are considered as representing the words and actions of an other, then is he a *Feigned or Artificiall person*.⁶²

To appreciate the scope of Hobbes's theory, and to locate the person of the state within his general scheme of things, we next need to consider these different types of person and the different ways in which it is possible for actions to be attributed to them.

Since the distinction between natural and artificial persons turns out to be fundamental to Hobbes's theory of the state, it is unfortunate that he introduces it in such an ambiguous way. In the second paragraph quoted above, strict grammar requires that the referent of the final 'he' should be 'an other', so that the artificial person must be the person represented. But the flow of the sentence suggests that the referent of 'he' must be the natural person mentioned at the start, in which case the artificial person must be the representative.

Hobbes initially resolved the ambiguity by endorsing the second possibility. Later in Chapter XVI he explains that 'Of Persons Artificiall, some have their words and actions *Owned* by those whom they represent', thereby making it clear that the artificial person is the representative.⁶³ It is yet more unfortunate, however, that so many of his interpreters have followed him at this point.⁶⁴ Not only are there conclusive reasons for preferring the alternative reading,⁶⁵ but

⁶²Hobbes 1996, p. 111.

⁶³Ibid p. 112. The passage makes no appearance in the Latin *Leviathan*.

⁶⁴The reason is that, insofar as Hobbes's commentators have examined his theory of persons, they have usually concentrated on Chapter XVI of *Leviathan*. Some have gone so far as to claim that Hobbes's articulation of his theory is almost wholly confined to that chapter. See, for example, Pitkin 1967, pp. 14–15; Gauthier 1969, p. 121. As a result, it has come to be widely agreed that Hobbes's distinction between natural and artificial persons is equivalent to the distinction between represented persons and their representatives. See, for example, Hood 1964, pp. 147–8; Pitkin 1967, pp. 15–16; Gauthier 1969, pp. 121–3; Jaume 1986, pp. 95–104; Baumgold 1988, pp. 38, 45; Martinich 1992, p. 165; Tukiainen 1994, p. 46; Martinich 1995, pp. 228–30; Zarka 1995, pp. 208–18; Runciman 1997, pp. 7–8, 33. But for two correctives to which I am indebted see Tricaud in Hobbes 1971, pp. 168–9 and Copp 1980, pp. 582–4.

⁶⁵These reasons are perhaps especially conclusive in the case of the person of the state. If we adopt Hobbes's initial proposal and call representatives artificial persons, then sovereigns are artificial persons while states are not. This is bad enough in itself, since states are obviously not natural persons, while sovereigns obviously are. The problem is made worse when commentators infer that, since the state is neither a natural nor an artificial person, it must be a *persona ficta*, this being the only remaining possibility in Hobbes's scheme of things. As I argue in section IV, however, it is crucial to Hobbes that, although the state is an artificial person, it is not a fictitious one.

Hobbes himself subsequently made it clear that this was the reading he wished to endorse. He first brings this out in the final chapter of *De Homine*, where he leaves no room for doubt that, when he speaks of artificial or fictional persons, he means persons represented:

What concerns the civil use of the term person can be defined as follows. *A person is someone to whom the words and actions of men are attributed, whether they are his own or those of someone else.* If they are his own, then the person is a *natural* one. If they are those of someone else, then the person is a *fictional* one.⁶⁶

The Latin *Leviathan* confirms this analysis:

A Person is *someone who acts either in his own name or in the name of someone else.* If he acts in his own name, then the Person is *his Own* or a *Natural* one; if he acts in the name of someone else, then the person is *Representative* of the one in whose name he acts.⁶⁷

Here the terminology of artificial persons is dropped, while the persons whom Hobbes had initially classified as artificial are now contrasted rather than equated with representatives.

It would be unwise, however, to assume that Hobbes simply nodded when he initially implied that representatives are engaged in a form of artifice. What he seems to have had in mind is that, when you serve as a representative, you act not as an individual but rather as the player of a legally or socially recognised role. He offers many examples: you can act as a lieutenant, a vicar, an attorney, a deputy, a procurator, a rector, a master, an overseer, a guardian, a curator and the like.⁶⁸ To adopt one or other of these *personae* is to play a part in a world that Hobbes never ceased to describe as artificial: the world of civil society in which our behaviour is conditioned and regulated by the artificial chains of the civil law.⁶⁹ The insight he evidently wished to capture is that there is a sense in which all the world's a stage.

With this clarification, I am now in a position to lay out Hobbes's considered views about the defining characteristics of natural persons. A natural person is someone capable of representing him or herself. In the words of Hobbes's initial definition, it is when someone's words and actions are 'considered as his own' that he can be described as 'a Naturall Person'. As we have seen, however, anyone capable of owning his actions in this way can also be described according to Hobbes as an author, and hence as capable of authorising other persons to

⁶⁶Hobbes 1839, p. 130: 'Quod autem ad usum personae civilem attinet, definiri potest hoc modo; *persona est, cui verba et actiones hominum attribuuntur vel suae vel alienae: si suae, persona naturalis est; si alienae, fictitia est.*

⁶⁷Hobbes 1668, p. 79: 'Persona est *is qui suo vel alieno nomine Res agit.* Si suo, Persona *Propria*, sive *Naturalis* est; si alieno, Persona est eius, cuius *Nomine agit Representativa.*'

⁶⁸Hobbes 1996, pp. 112–13; cf. Hobbes 1668, pp. 80–1, where he lists *Deputati, Procuratores* and *Proreges*, and later adds *Rectores, Curatores* and *Tutores.*

⁶⁹Hobbes speaks of the civil society in which we live as artificial (*artificialis*) and as tied together by artificial chains (*Vincula Artificialia*) in the Latin as well as in the English *Leviathan*. See Hobbes 1996, pp. 9–10, 147 and cf. Hobbes 1668, pp. 1, 105.

serve as his representatives. A further defining characteristic of natural persons must therefore be that they are capable of converting themselves—for certain determinate purposes—into represented or artificial persons by way of commissioning others to act in their name.

We may say, then, that in isolating the category of natural persons Hobbes has two closely connected ideas in mind. One is that natural persons are those capable of autonomously choosing whatever roles they may wish to assume in social life. Hobbes is very fond of quoting a remark of Cicero's to the effect that (as he translates it in *Leviathan*) it is possible to 'bear' a number of different persons simultaneously.⁷⁰ Hobbes's most interesting gloss on the dictum appears in his posthumously published *Answer* to John Bramhall's *The Catching of Leviathan*:

Cicero, in an epistle to Atticus, saith thus: *Unus sustineo tres personas, mei, adversarii, et judicis*: that is, 'I that am but one man, sustain three persons; mine own person, the person of my adversary, and the person of the judge'. Cicero was here the substance intelligent, one man; and because he pleaded for himself, he calls himself his own person: and again, because he pleaded for his adversary, he says, he sustained the person of his adversary: and lastly, because he himself gave the sentence, he says, he sustained the person of the judge. In the same sense we use the word in English vulgarly, calling him that acteth by his own authority, his own person, and him that acteth by the authority of another, the person of that other. And thus we have the exact meaning of the word *person*.⁷¹

Hobbes's allusion here to the idea of 'being one's own man' points to his second and closely related thought: that a natural person is someone under no one else's sway. He is someone capable of voicing his own thoughts, of making his own promises, of agreeing the terms of his own contracts and covenants.

It is worth underlining these implications, since they have the effect of making the category of natural persons a remarkably narrow one.⁷² Hobbes seems to have come to terms with this aspect of his theory only in the course of working it out. When he first speaks of 'men as persons natural' in *The Elements*, he appears to treat all human beings as natural persons.⁷³ But in *Leviathan* he explicitly states that many people lack the required ability to act on their own behalf,

⁷⁰Hobbes 1996, p. 112. He also quotes the dictum in the corresponding passage of the Latin *Leviathan* (and again in the Appendix); in Chapter XV of *De Homine*; and in his *Answer* to Bramhall. See, respectively, Hobbes 1668, pp. 80, 342; Hobbes 1839, XV.1, p. 130; Hobbes 1845, p. 310.

⁷¹Hobbes 1840a, pp. 310–11.

⁷²But as Tricaud 1982 notes, Hobbes also speaks of human beings as persons in familiar, non-technical ways. In Part I of *Leviathan* he consistently uses 'person' to refer to any man, woman or child. See Hobbes 1996, pp. 10, 16, 17–19, 48–9, 51–2, 58, 80, 82–3, 104. In Part II he uses the term to refer more specifically to the living bodies of men, women and children. See Hobbes 1996, pp. 141, 152, 154, 160, 208, 214, 236, 238.

⁷³Hobbes 1969, p. xiv.

including ‘Children, Fooles, and Mad-men’.⁷⁴ On the one hand, such persons are undoubtedly capable of acting and of exercising rights, since they are capable of having actions attributed to them on the basis of their performance by guardians authorised to act in their name. But on the other hand, they ‘can be no Authors (during that time) of any action done by them’, because they have no capacity to take responsibility for any actions their guardians may undertake.⁷⁵

Nor does Hobbes even treat the class of natural persons as coterminous with that of sane adult males. In Hobbes’s England some twenty per cent of the latter class would have been servants,⁷⁶ and servants according to Hobbes are not to be counted as natural persons, or at least not for a considerable number of purposes.⁷⁷ This exclusion stems from the fact that the civil law takes lawful families to be united in ‘the Father, or Master’ as ‘one Person Representative’.⁷⁸ But to say that a father is a representative is to say that he has the right to speak and act in the name of his entire family.⁷⁹ This in turn means that, insofar as the father chooses to exercise this right, his household servants (to say nothing of his wife and children) cannot be counted as natural persons, since they lack the required capacity to speak and act on their own behalf.⁸⁰

I next need to examine Hobbes’s contrasting concept of an artificial person, which is of still greater importance for his theory of the state. So far we have seen that some natural persons can be artificial at the same time. But Hobbes is principally interested in those artificial persons who are not natural persons at all. These are persons capable of being represented, but incapable of acting as authors in the distinctive manner of natural persons, and hence of authorising their own representatives. It follows that, while it is possible for such artificial persons to speak and act, it is possible for them to do so *only* if their words and actions can validly be attributed to them on the basis of their performance by some other person or collectivity licensed to act in their name.

⁷⁴Hobbes 1996, p. 113. The converse also holds: there is at least one natural person who is not a human being. This is because God is a natural person according to Hobbes. First, He is unquestionably an author, since he is ‘the author of Nature’, and also of the Scriptures in the sense that they contain His authorised word. See Hobbes 1996, pp. 215, 267. But in addition He has chosen (on three occasions so far) to turn himself into an artificial person by way of authorising representatives to speak and act in his name. Hobbes’s view of the *tres personae* of the Holy Trinity is that they are representatives of God. See Hobbes 1996, pp. 114, 340–1 and cf. Lessay 1992 pp. 179–86.

⁷⁵Hobbes 1996, p. 113. The time to which Hobbes refers is the time of their childhood, folly or madness.

⁷⁶I am greatly indebted to Keith Wrightson for making this computation on my behalf. His figure is derived from information in Wrigley and Schofield 1981, esp. p. 528 and Kussmaul 1981, esp. pp. 3–4.

⁷⁷The proviso is important, because Hobbes is here treading a very fine line. A servant ordered to walk to a neighbour’s house with a message who instead chooses to run will apparently be running to the house (as opposed to somewhere else) as an artificial person, but running (as opposed to walking) as a natural one.

⁷⁸Hobbes 1996, pp. 162–3.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, p. 142.

⁸⁰There is a remarkably close parallel with the Leveller refusal to include servants even in an extended franchise on the grounds that ‘they are included in their masters’. See Woodhouse 1938, p. 83.

Hobbes proposes no particular term to isolate this category, but it may be helpful to designate them *purely* artificial persons to distinguish them from those who voluntarily take on this status by authorising others to represent them. As we have seen, Hobbes further lays it down that two sub-classes need to be considered: those whose words and actions can be ‘truly’ attributed to them, and those who can only have words and actions attributed to them ‘by Fiction’.

Nothing further is said in *Leviathan* about the class of purely artificial persons who are also fictitious. But in *De Homine* it emerges that what Hobbes has in mind are the characters impersonated by actors on the stage:

For it was understood in the ancient⁸¹ theatre that not the player himself but someone else was speaking, for example Agamemnon, namely when the player, putting on the fictitious mask of Agamemnon, was for the time being Agamemnon. At a later stage, however,⁸² this was understood to be so even in the absence of the fictitious mask, namely when the actor declared publicly which person he was going to play.⁸³

This is a dark passage, but the implications for my present argument can perhaps be spelled out as follows. If I play the part of Agamemnon on the stage, the actions I perform in the *persona* of Agamemnon will be taken by the audience to be Agamemnon’s actions rather than mine. They will not ‘truly’ be taken to be Agamemnon’s actions, however, but only ‘by fiction’ and a willing suspension of disbelief. This will especially be the case if I follow the convention of pointing out that I am merely engaged in a performance. For then it will be obvious that no other person is involved, and thus that there is no one else to whom my actions can validly be attributed.⁸⁴

Some commentators have taken exception to Hobbes’s inclusion of stage characters in his account. As Pitkin emphasises, Hobbes lays it down that, if there is to be a valid act of representation, there must be some natural person or collectivity in possession of the right to authorise it. Pitkin adds that this requirement makes no sense in the case of actors in a play. ‘No one has authorized their actions, neither the person(s) they represent nor any third party’.⁸⁵ But this is an unhistorical criticism. By 1640, the year in which Hobbes completed *The Elements*, the compulsory licensing of theatrical productions had been a feature of English law for nearly a century. The official with the right to

⁸¹I have added this adjective, since Hobbes makes clear in the preceding sentence that he is referring to ancient Greece and Rome.

⁸²A later stage, that is, in the evolution of theatrical conventions, when masks were no longer worn.

⁸³Hobbes 1839, XV.1, p. 130. ‘Intelligebatur enim in theatro loqui non ipse histrio, sed aliquis alius, puta Agamemnon, nimirum faciem fictitiam Agamemnonis induente histrione, qui pro illo tempore erat Agamemnon; quod tamen postea intelligebatur etiam sine facie ficta, nimirum profitente se actore quam personam acturus erat’.

⁸⁴From the fact, however, that the action of a play does not ‘truly’ take place, it does not follow for Hobbes that a play might not create as powerful an impression as an action ‘truly’ performed. See Hobbes 1969, p. 68, where he goes to the extreme of arguing that, because ‘not truth, but Image, maketh passion’, it follows that ‘a Tragedie affecteth no lesse than a Murder, if well acted.’

⁸⁵Pitkin 1967, p. 25.

authorise the representation of fictional characters on the stage was the Master of the Revels, from whom a permit had to be purchased for every play intended for public performance.⁸⁶ Two years later, moreover, all the theatres in England were closed by Act of Parliament.⁸⁷ While it remained possible to impersonate Agamemnon on the stage, it was no longer legally permissible to do so, since it was no longer possible to obtain the necessary license. It is, in short, anachronistic to suggest that Hobbes introduced any inconsistency into his general theory of persons by implying that theatrical representations have to be authorised. He was writing in a society in which the need for such authorisation was taken for granted.

I turn finally to Hobbes's other class of purely artificial persons: those who, while incapable of acting except through representatives, are nevertheless capable of having words and actions 'truly' attributed to them. As we have seen, Hobbes regards some human beings as purely artificial in this sense. But he is more interested in the fact that various inanimate objects and even figments of the imagination can be classified in a similar way. Among inanimate objects he lists 'a Church, an Hospital, a Bridge'. Since these are 'things Inanimate' they 'cannot be Authors, nor therefore give Authority to their Actors'. Nevertheless, they can perfectly well be personated or represented 'by a Rector, Master, or Overseer' who can be commissioned and thereby given authority to act on their behalf.⁸⁸ Among imaginary objects he singles out the gods of the heathen. Such idols obviously cannot be authors, 'for an Idol is nothing'.⁸⁹ Nevertheless, in ancient times such deities were frequently recognised as having the ability not merely to own possessions but to exercise rights. As in the case of the hospital and the bridge, these capacities stemmed from the fact that authorised persons (in this case officiating priests) were assigned a legal right to act in their name.⁹⁰

To classify bridges, hospitals and imaginary objects as persons may seem the merest abuse of language, and Hobbes in *Leviathan* undoubtedly baulks at expressing his argument in these terms. He clearly believes that almost anything can count as a person, since almost anything can be validly represented. But the most he is prepared to say is that 'there are few things, that are incapable of being represented by Fiction'.⁹¹ The phrase is misleading, however, as well as being far from perspicuous, because Hobbes does not in fact believe that hospitals and bridges can only be represented 'by fiction' in the manner of Agamemnon. On the contrary, it is crucial to his argument that, if the hospital or the bridge is validly represented by an authorised overseer, then the actions of the overseer will 'truly' count as the actions of the hospital or the bridge. Eventually

⁸⁶Bentley 1971, pp. 145–50.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. viii.

⁸⁸Hobbes 1996, p. 113.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 114. As he later points out (1996, p. 445), he is quoting St. Paul.

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 113–14.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 113. But he already concedes (1996, p. 339) that by 'a Person' he simply means 'he that is represented'.

Hobbes resolved the problem by biting the bullet. When he translated *Leviathan* into Latin, he rewrote the passage to say that, since there are few things incapable of being represented, ‘there are few things incapable of being persons’.⁹² Meanwhile he had conceded in *De Homine* that ‘even an inanimate thing can be a person, that is, can own possessions and other goods and be able to act at law’, so long as it is capable of being validly represented.⁹³

The category of purely artificial persons leaves Hobbes with one last problem to solve. Who has the right to authorise their representation? We have seen that, in the case of fictional *personae*, the answer in Hobbes’s time was completely determinate: the right was possessed by the Master of the Revels acting as an officer of state. But what of purely artificial persons who are not fictional, but who possess (like the bridge) their own independent reality, or may even be able to count (like the child or madman) as natural persons for certain purposes? We still need a test for judging whether a third party who lays claim to authorise someone to represent such persons has a valid title to invite such a representative to act in their name.

The solution Hobbes puts forward is that the person performing such acts of authorisation must stand in some appropriate relationship of dominion or ownership with respect to the purely artificial person concerned.⁹⁴ One possibility, Hobbes suggests, would be for the relationship to be that of ownership in the strict sense. This applies to the case of the bridge: Hobbes specifically states that the person who authorises the overseer to procure its maintenance must be its proprietor.⁹⁵ A second possibility would be for the relationship to be that of a governor to his charge. This applies to the case of the church and the hospital, and equally to the fool, the madman and the child: all stand in need of governors with sufficient legal standing to authorise rectors or guardians to act on their behalf.⁹⁶ A third possibility would be for the dominion to be that of the state itself. When, for example, the gods of the heathen were represented by priests, their authority according to Hobbes ‘proceeded from the State’.⁹⁷ Finally, Hobbes considers a fourth possibility to which he attaches particular importance, although he only mentions it explicitly when discussing family power later in *Leviathan*. This last form of dominion arises when the first

⁹²Hobbes 1668, p. 80: ‘Paucae res sunt, quarum non possunt esse Personae’.

⁹³Hobbes 1839, XV.4, p. 132: ‘Etiam rei inanimatae persona esse potest, id est, possessiones et alia bona habere, et iure agere potest’. It is thus a mistake to infer, as does Runciman 1997, p. 21, that ‘unrepresented “fooles” are not persons’. A person is anyone *capable* of being represented.

⁹⁴Weimann 1996 pp. 12–13 comments on this linkage of authority with ownership.

⁹⁵Hobbes 1996, p. 113.

⁹⁶It is not clear, however, why Hobbes appears to exclude the possibility that the owner of the bridge or the governor of the child might decide to commission himself. If I stand in a relation of dominion with respect to the bridge or the child, then according to Hobbes I can authorise anyone I like to represent them. But if I can authorise anyone, then I can certainly authorise myself.

⁹⁷Hobbes 1996, p. 114.

party brings the third into existence.⁹⁸ Again Hobbes has in mind the case of children, and offers as an example the right of dominion over infants in the state of nature. Since it will always be the mother who brings her child into the world, ‘the right of Dominion over the Child dependeth on her will, and is consequently hers.’⁹⁹ She can either decide to nourish it, or to abandon it, or to dispose of her rights in it to someone else.¹⁰⁰

IV

I am now in a position to apply Hobbes’s general theory to solve the puzzle I stated at the outset concerning the person of the state. How can such a seemingly insubstantial person be the holder of sovereignty and the seat of power?

First we need to see exactly where Hobbes places the person of the state on his general map. He begins in Chapter XVI of *Leviathan* by considering the process by which the members of a multitude living in a condition of mere nature can manage, as he puts it, to ‘institute’ a legitimate commonwealth or state.¹⁰¹ The only means by which they can do so, he argues, is by transforming themselves into an artificial person by way of authorising some natural person or persons to represent them. This is not in the least to say that the multitude acts in the manner of a single *persona* in agreeing to set up a government. This had been the view of the so-called ‘monarchomach’ or ‘king killing’ writers of the French religious wars.¹⁰² The author of the *Vindiciae, Contra Tyrannos*, for example, had argued in discussing the exemplary case of Israel that the king had acted as one party to the covenant and the people as the other. Both were able to contract as single persons, the king because he was a natural person, the people because they constituted a *universitas* and ‘were therefore able to play the part of a single person’.¹⁰³ But it is precisely this monarchomach view of the people as a natural unity capable of acting as one person that Hobbes aimed to discredit. ‘The Multitude naturally is not *One*, but *Many*’, he retorts, so that it is only ‘the *Unity*

⁹⁸But Hobbes implicitly mentions this form of dominion in Chapter XVII (1996, p. 120) since it underlies his pattern of sexual imagery, especially his claim that Leviathan is engendered out of the union of the multitude.

⁹⁹Hobbes 1996, p. 140.

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹⁰¹My analysis applies only to sovereignty ‘by *Institution*’, not to sovereignty ‘by *Acquisition*’. Hobbes introduces this distinction at the end of Chapter XVII of *Leviathan*, thereafter devoting Chapters XVIII and XIX to ‘institution’ and Chapter XX to ‘acquisition’. See Hobbes 1996, pp. 121–45. Sovereignty is said to be ‘acquired’ when the members of a multitude covenant not with each other but with a conqueror to whom they individually submit themselves. Presumably Hobbes believes that the latter type of covenant also has the effect of converting the multitude into an artificial person—the person of the state—with the conqueror as its sovereign representative. But he never says so, and his analysis of sovereignty by acquisition makes no mention of the person of the state. Although sovereignty by acquisition is in some ways the basic case (as Hoekstra 1998 has argued), it is not clear that Hobbes has thought out his views about artificial persons in relation to it.

¹⁰²On these writers see Skinner 1978, vol. II, pp. 302–48.

¹⁰³Garnett 1994, p. 38: ‘*universitas enim hominum unius personae vicem sustinet*’.

of the Representer, not the *Unity* of the Represented, that maketh the Person *One*'. The only way in which 'a Multitude of men, are made *One Person*' is 'when they are by one man, or one Person, Represented'. There is, in short, no natural unity outside the state; unity and community are attained only with the appointment of a representative, and 'cannot otherwise be understood in multitude'.¹⁰⁴

In Chapter XVII Hobbes goes on to describe the mechanism by which this transformation takes place. It is as if each individual should agree with everyone else 'to conferre all their power and strength upon one Man, or upon one Assembly of men, that may reduce all their Wills, by plurality of voices, unto one Will'. When they perform this act of mutual covenanting, this is as much as to say that they 'appoint one Man, or Assembly of men, to beare their Person'. So the outcome 'is more than Consent, or Concord; it is a reall Unitie of them all, in one and the same Person', in consequence of which they are now able, through the agency of the person representing them, to act in the manner of a single person with one will and voice.¹⁰⁵

The name of the artificial person brought into existence when a multitude forms itself into such a unity is the commonwealth or state. As soon as the members of the multitude agree, each with each, 'to appoint one Man, or Assembly of men, to beare their Person', the multitude 'so united in one Person, is called a COMMON-WEALTH, in latine CIVITAS'¹⁰⁶—the term Hobbes also translates as 'state'.¹⁰⁷ This union or coupling together has the effect of engendering immediate issue in just the manner of a marital union blessed by God—although with one crucial difference later emphasised by Hobbes, namely, that the offspring produced by the union of the multitude has no determinate gender, for 'though *man* be *male* and *female*, *authority* is not.¹⁰⁸ As for the name by which Hobbes wishes this figure of authority to be known, he informs us of it in his gravest tones. 'This is the Generation of that great LEVIATHAN, or rather (to speake more reverently) of that *Mortall God*, to which wee owe under the *Immortal God*, our peace and defence'.¹⁰⁹

We still need to know the name of the person appointed by the members of the multitude to act in their name when they take the decision to be represented. Hobbes replies that the name of this person is the sovereign, who is thereby given authority to 'bear' or 'carry' or act the part of the purely artificial person of the state. The commonwealth or state 'is *One Person*', and 'he that carryeth this Person, is called SOVERAIGNE, and said to have *Soveraigne Power*'.¹¹⁰ The same distinction is subsequently drawn even more clearly in the Latin version of

¹⁰⁴Hobbes 1996, p. 114.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 120; cf. Polin 1981, p. 95 and Tukiainen 1994, p. 48.

¹⁰⁷Hobbes's preferred translation of *civitas* is 'Commonwealth'. See, for example, Hobbes 1996, pp. 120, 183. But when he uses 'state' as a translation, the word he is translating is almost always *civitas*. For the most striking instance see Hobbes 1996, p. 9.

¹⁰⁸Hobbes 1840b, p. 434.

¹⁰⁹Hobbes 1996, p. 120.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 121.

Leviathan. There the holder of *summa potestas* or sovereign power is described, in a phrase closely echoing Cicero's *De Officiis*, as 'he who bears the Person of the State'.¹¹¹ The sovereign may in turn be a natural person, as in the case of a monarchy, or an assembly of natural persons, as in the case of an aristocracy or democracy.¹¹² But in every case the legal standing of the sovereign will be that of 'the absolute Representative of all the subjects'.¹¹³

It is worth underlining the complexity of Hobbes's argument, if only because so many even of his best commentators have oversimplified it. We are told that the 'civil person' brought into existence by the union of the multitude is the sovereign.¹¹⁴ As we have seen, however, the name of the person engendered by the transformation of the multitude into one person through their agreement to appoint a representative is not the sovereign but the state. The sovereign is the name of the representative of the multitude united in one person, and is thus the name of the representative of the state.

Armed with this analysis, we can now see how the apparently insubstantial person of the state can nevertheless be the holder of sovereignty and the seat of power. Hobbes concedes of course that all the actions performed by states will in fact be performed by sovereigns acting in their 'politique' capacity.¹¹⁵ He is always careful to insist, however, that sovereigns are not the proprietors of their sovereignty. They are the holders of offices with duties attached, their fundamental duty being to procure the safety and contentment of the people. Although they are granted the right to exercise complete sovereign power, this power is merely 'placed' and 'resideth' in them by virtue of the office they are asked to discharge.¹¹⁶ The true status of all lawful sovereigns is thus that they are merely 'the Person representative of all and every one of the Multitude'.¹¹⁷

As I have shown, however, the central contention of Hobbes's theory of attributed action is that, whenever a person or collectivity agrees to appoint such

¹¹¹Hobbes 1668, p. 86: 'Is autem qui Civitas Personam gerit, *Summam* habere dicitur *Potestatem*'. Cf. Cicero 1913, I. XXXIV. 124, p. 126 on the office of magistrates: 'se gerere personam civitatis'.

¹¹²Hobbes 1996, p. 129. The question of how assemblies can act as representatives obviously raises further questions, but I am concerned here only with the basic case. So is Hobbes, for he never explains how collectivities can represent the state. According to his general theory, such assemblies will themselves have to be persons, that is, will have to be represented. But who can represent an assembly, and by what process can they be authorised? Copp 1980, p. 599 suggests that Hobbes must regard assemblies as their own representatives, but Hobbes himself never pronounces on this point.

¹¹³Hobbes 1996, p. 156.

¹¹⁴See, for example, Baumgold 1988, pp. 38–9; Burgess 1990, p. 687; Fukuda 1997, p. 43; Martinich 1997, pp. 44–9. But see, by contrast, Jaume 1986, esp. pp. 99–100 and Zarka 1995, esp. pp. 212, 225.

¹¹⁵Hobbes 1996, p. 131. See also Hobbes 1996, pp. 136, 149, 174, 184, 186, 214, 239 and esp. 253 for general claims to the effect that the only way in which the state can act is for the sovereign representative to act in its name.

¹¹⁶Hobbes 1996, pp. 127, 144, and cf. 231. On the sovereign as the holder of an office of trust see Hobbes 1996, pp. 126, 143.

¹¹⁷Hobbes 1996, p. 129. See also Hobbes 1996, pp. 121, 155–6, 167, 185, 212, 223 for other references to the fact that the sovereign is merely the representative of the state. It appears to be a shorthand, or perhaps a slip, when Hobbes instead states (1996, p. 187) that the sovereign *is* 'the Person of the Common-wealth' (rather than the representative of that Person).

a representative, whatever actions are thereafter performed by the representative in their name will be attributable not to the representative but rather to the person or collectivity being represented. Not only will those who appoint the representative be held accountable for the consequences of any actions undertaken on their behalf, but the actions in question will actually count as theirs, not as those of the representative who carries them out. It follows that, whenever our sovereigns exercise their powers in order to procure our safety and contentment, the acts they perform should not be regarded as their own but rather as those of the person whom they are representing, that is, the person of the state. This, then, is how it comes about that we can properly speak—and not by metaphor—of the commonwealth or state as the person who imposes the laws and thereby ensures that our safety and contentment are secured. Although the sovereign is always the legislator, the legislator ‘is always the Representative of the Common-wealth’.¹¹⁸ So ‘the name of the person Commanding’ is not the sovereign but the person whom the sovereign represents. And the name of that person, as Hobbes eventually declares in a further echo of Cicero, is ‘*Persona Civitatis*, the Person of the Common-wealth’.¹¹⁹

It is important to emphasise Hobbes’s route to this conclusion, if only because a number of his commentators have claimed to find in this theory of the state an incipient or latent belief in the real personality of groups.¹²⁰ The will of the sovereign, we are told, comes to be identical with that of the commonwealth because Hobbes presents us with a vision ‘of an organic community, whose will is the sovereign’s will’.¹²¹ It is certainly true, according to Hobbes, that there cannot fail to be an identity between the will of a lawful sovereign and the will of the commonwealth or state. As I have laboured to demonstrate, however, this is not in the least because Hobbes believes in any kind of organic unity between the two. It is simply because he insists that all lawful sovereigns are representatives, and thus that all their public actions must be attributed to the person whom they represent, namely the person of the state.

It remains for Hobbes to distinguish between the representation and misrepresentation of the state’s authority. How are we to discriminate between lawful sovereigns and those who merely usurp the powers of the state without enjoying the standing of accredited representatives? To put the question the other way round, who has the right to authorise the actions of the state?

It is not open to Hobbes to reply that sovereigns possess this right. Sovereigns are merely representatives, and all representatives must themselves be authorised. Nor can the actions of the state be authorised by the state itself. If an agent is to authorise its own actions it must be a natural person, capable of exercising its

¹¹⁸Hobbes 1996, p. 223.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 183; cf. Cicero 1913, I. XXXIV. 124, p. 126. Lessay 1992, pp. 159–60 discusses the allusion.

¹²⁰Forsyth 1981, pp. 197–8.

¹²¹Baumgold 1988, p. 39.

own rights and acting in its own name. But the state is not a natural person; on the contrary, there is a sense in which it more closely resembles a fictitious person such as Agamemnon in Aeschylus's play of that name. Agamemnon has no existence, except as words on a page, until he is brought to life by the skills of an actor who impersonates him and speaks his lines. The state likewise amounts to little more than a verbal entity in the absence of a sovereign to represent it and play its part in the world.

This is not to say that Hobbes regards the state as a *persona ficta*, as some of his commentators have maintained.¹²² As we have seen, the defining characteristic of such *personae* is that, when someone represents them, the acts performed by their representatives will be attributable to such persons merely 'by fiction'. But it is of the utmost importance to Hobbes's theory that the acts performed by sovereigns are 'truly' attributable to the state and are in fact the actions of the state in the real world.

While the state is not fictional, however, it is undoubtedly a member of the class of persons I have characterised as purely artificial, and bears a close resemblance to such exemplary members of the class as hospitals, bridges and so forth. Like such inanimate objects, the state is unquestionably capable of acting, since it is capable of being represented and of having actions 'truly' attributed to it. Like such objects, however, the state cannot give authority to anyone to represent it, and cannot therefore authorise its own representation. As Hobbes puts it, it has no capacity 'to doe any thing, but by the Representative'.¹²³ So shadowy, indeed, is its existence that it might be thought to bear a yet closer resemblance to such purely artificial persons as the gods of the heathen. Whereas hospitals and bridges remain things even when they are not being personated, the state in the absence of a sovereign 'is but a word', just as the gods of the heathen are 'nothing' in the absence of a priest to represent them.¹²⁴

Who then is capable of authorising the actions of the state? We already know the answer in general terms from our examination of how it is possible for one person validly to authorise a second to represent a third—as in the case of the owner of a bridge who authorises an overseer to act on its behalf. As we have seen, two requirements must be met. One is that the natural person or persons authorising the representation must themselves possess the right to undertake whatever actions they intend to authorise. The other is that this right must in turn be owed to the fact that they stand in some appropriate relationship of dominion over the purely artificial person concerned.

According to Hobbes there is only one possible way in which these conditions can be satisfied in the case of the state. The public acts of sovereigns will count as valid acts of the state if and only if the sovereign has been authorised to perform

¹²²See, for example, Gierke 1957, pp. 44–7; Oakeshott 1975, p. 204; Runciman 1997, pp. 14, 18, 29.

¹²³Hobbes 1996, pp. 171, 184.

¹²⁴Ibid., pp. 245, 114.

them by each and every member of the multitude. With this contention, Hobbes is finally able to offer his formal definition of a commonwealth or state: it is ‘*One Person, of whose Acts a great Multitude, by mutuall Covenants one with another, have made themselves every one the Author, to the end he may use the strength and means of them all, as he shall think expedient, for their Peace and Common Defence*’.¹²⁵

Hobbes makes good this central contention by pointing out in the first place that the individual members of the multitude undoubtedly possess the right to perform the actions undertaken by sovereigns as representatives of the state. When Hobbes describes the lines of conduct that sovereigns are authorised to pursue, he always makes it clear that their rights of action are merely those possessed by each one of us in the state of nature. These rights can be summarised as the blameless liberty of using our powers in any way we judge necessary to defend our lives against others and secure ourselves against threats by anticipating them.¹²⁶ Because the exercise of these equal rights brings war, we are led by reason to recognise that the best means of attaining peace and other contentments of life will be to transfer our rights to a sovereign who will exercise them on our behalf. When we covenant to appoint such a sovereign, it is accordingly with the specific purpose of providing more effectively for our own peace and contentment. The sovereign is commissioned, in other words, merely to exercise those of our rights which, so long as we exercise them ourselves, will lead to war.¹²⁷

Finally, Hobbes argues in addition that the individual members of the multitude stand—and alone stand—in an appropriate relationship of dominion with respect to the person of the state. The source of their dominion lies in the fact that the union of the multitude brings the state into existence. As a result, the relationship of the multitude to the state is analogous to that of the mother to her infant in the state of nature. Just as the mother brings her child into the world, thereby acquiring dominion over it, so the union of the multitude serves to procreate the state. Hobbes goes to the almost blasphemous extreme of drawing a parallel between this act of engendering and the work of God. ‘*The Pacts and Covenants, by which the parts of this Body Politique were at first made, set together, and united, resemble that Fiat, or the Let us make man, pronounced by God in the Creation*’.¹²⁸

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 121.

¹²⁶Ibid., pp. 87–8, 91.

¹²⁷Ibid., pp. 87–9, 124, 131.

¹²⁸Ibid., pp. 9–10. But does the artifice created by the multitude more closely resemble a man or a machine? See Tukiainen 1994 and Runciman 1997, pp. 16–24 for Hobbes’s contrasting structures of imagery at this point.

V

What prompted Hobbes to develop this novel and intricate theory of the state? The clue lies, I believe, in attending to what he says at the outset of *Leviathan* about his hopes for the work. He aspires, he says, to pass unwounded between the opposing swords of ‘those that contend, on one side for too great liberty, and on the other side for too much Authority’.¹²⁹

Those contending for too much authority are identifiable as the theorists of divine right, who rose to renewed prominence in the face of the Parliamentary attack on the English crown in the early 1640s. All political power, these writers declare, is ‘naturall’;¹³⁰ God is its ‘immediate Author’¹³¹ and all rulers acquire it from divine ordination rather than from the consent of the people, who have ‘no more *possibility* in right to choose their *Kings*, then to choose their *Fathers*’.¹³² Hobbes’s vision of the state as an artificial person authorised by its own citizens has the effect of challenging this entire line of argument. All political power, he replies, is ‘Artificiall’;¹³³ the only source from which the authority of the state can validly flow is ‘the consent of every one of the Subjects’.¹³⁴ The capacity of sovereigns to act as legitimate representatives of the state must therefore be ‘derived originally from the consent of every one of those that are to be governed’.¹³⁵ The state is a wholly human contrivance, not an outcome of God’s providence.

During the civil wars of the 1640s, this view of consent became one of the leading arguments used by the supporters of Parliament to question the powers of the crown. Drawing on the work of the monarchomachs, Henry Parker developed perhaps the most influential version of the argument in his *Observations* of 1642.¹³⁶ He begins by restating the monarchomach claim¹³⁷ that the only way in which lawful authority can arise is when ‘a societie of men’, acting in the manner of a *universitas*, agrees by ‘common consent’ to set it up.¹³⁸ One implication is that, since ‘the fountaine and efficient cause’ of all authority ‘is the people’, it follows that ‘the King, though he be *singulis Major*, yet he is *universis minor*’—of lesser standing than ‘the whole universality’ from which his power is derived.¹³⁹ A further implication is that, if the king violates the terms of the covenant imposed by the *universitas* of the people in granting him power,

¹²⁹Hobbes 1996, p. 3.

¹³⁰Morton 1643, p. 3.

¹³¹Williams 1643, pp. 48, 49; Maxwell 1644, p. 19. See Sanderson 1989, p. 48 for the attribution of this tract to Maxwell.

¹³²Williams 1643, pp. 43, 48.

¹³³Hobbes 1996, p. 120.

¹³⁴Hobbes 1996, p. 219; cf. pp. 114, 150.

¹³⁵Hobbes 1996, p. 395; cf. p. 121.

¹³⁶See Sommerville 1992, pp. 60–3; Mendle 1995, pp. 70–89.

¹³⁷The influence of monarchomach thought, in particular the *Vindiciae*, was noted by Parker’s critics at the time. See Mendle 1995, pp. 123–5.

¹³⁸Parker 1934, p. 167.

¹³⁹See Parker 1934, pp. 168, 210, and cf. Garnett 1994, pp. 47–8, 78, 107, 157–8, 172 for the use of the *maior singulis, minor universis* formula in the *Vindiciae*.

they must retain the right to withdraw their consent and set down the authority they originally set up. As Parker summarises, ‘the whole universality’ of the people is not only the ‘free and voluntary Author’ of all sovereignty; it also retains its original sovereignty at all times, and accordingly remains ‘the proper Subject of all power’.¹⁴⁰

While Hobbes agrees that all lawful government arises from consent, he violently disagrees with the radical implications drawn from this argument by the supporters of Parliament. He seeks instead to demonstrate that these alleged implications embody a peculiarly dangerous plea for too great liberty. As before, moreover, the way in which he mounts his case is by invoking and applying exactly the theory of attributed action on which I have concentrated.

One way in which Hobbes applies his theory is by recurring to his rival account of how it is possible for a multitude to act as ‘one person’. A proper understanding of this process, he insists, will wholly defuse the Parliamentary argument:

There is little ground for the opinion of them, that say of Sovereign Kings, though they be *singulis majores*, of greater Power than every one of their Subjects, yet they be *Universis minores*, of lesse power than them all together. For if by *all together*, they mean not the collective body as one person, then *all together*, and *every one*, signifie the same; and the speech is absurd. But if by *all together*, they understand them as one Person (which person the Sovereign bears,) then the power of all together, is the same with the Sovereigns power; and so again the speech is absurd.¹⁴¹

Hobbes’s fiercely polemical message is that, since the people only transform themselves into a collective body by way of instituting a sovereign, it makes no sense to think of them as a collective body setting limits in advance to the exercise of sovereign power.

The main way, however, in which Hobbes applies his theory of attributed action to attack the Parliamentary cause is by invoking his analysis of what it means to authorise a representative. If we understand this process aright, he insists, we shall see that it is the merest *non sequitur* to suppose that the theory of covenanting commits us to defending the sovereignty of the people. On the contrary, we shall see that the idea of consent as the only source of lawful government is fully compatible with a strong defence of absolute sovereignty and the duty of non-resistance.

As we have seen, Hobbes stipulates that, if an act of authorisation is to be validly performed, a transfer of right must take place. Once this covenant has passed, the authorising agent is left with two specific obligations towards his or her representatives. One is the duty to ‘own’ their actions and those of any third party for whom they may have been authorised to act. But the other is the duty

¹⁴⁰Parker 1642, pp. 167, 210.

¹⁴¹Hobbes 1996, p. 128; cf. Sommerville 1996, p. 262.

not to interfere with the execution of their commission, since the right to act as they think best in discharging their task is precisely what has been voluntarily handed over to them.

In chapter XVII of *Leviathan* Hobbes argues that the covenant by which lawful states are instituted takes exactly this form. When the members of the multitude agree, each with each, to appoint a sovereign representative, theirs is a covenant of authorisation embodying a declaration that a body of rights has been transferred. They covenant ‘in such manner, as if every man should say to every man, *I Authorise and give up my Right of Governing my selfe, to this Man, or to this Assembly of men*’.¹⁴² At the same time Hobbes examines the precise character of the covenant involved. What the members of the multitude agree is ‘to conferre all their power and strength upon one Man, or upon one Assembly of men’.¹⁴³ But as we have seen, this has the effect of producing two immediate consequences. It gives them a single will and voice, thereby converting them into one person, the person of the state. But it also creates a representative of that person in the figure of the sovereign, who is given the job of ‘bearing’ or ‘carrying’ the person of the state. To say all this, however, is to say that the members of the multitude remain the authors of all the actions of their sovereign, and at the same time remain the authors of all the actions of the person whom they have authorised their sovereign to represent, namely, the person of the state. Each member of the multitude must now ‘acknowledge himselfe to be Author of whatsoever he that so beareth their Person, shall Act, or cause to be Acted, in those things which concerne the Common Peace and Safetie’.¹⁴⁴

Hobbes lastly turns, in chapter XVIII, to consider the implications of this political covenant. The members of the multitude have given up their right of using their own discretion to secure their safety and contentment. They have voluntarily handed over their right of self-government to be exercised by their sovereign on their behalf. It follows, according to Hobbes’s theory of authorisation, that the members of the multitude must now be under an absolute obligation not to interfere with their sovereign in the exercise of the rights they have transferred to him. The sovereign acquires complete discretion and absolute power to decide what should be done to preserve the safety and contentment of every subject under his charge.

Hobbes goes still further. Not only do the members of the multitude have no remaining right to question the actions of their sovereign; they have a positive duty to ‘own’ whatever actions their sovereign may undertake in seeking their safety and contentment. But this is to say, according to Hobbes’s theory of attributed action, that the public acts of the sovereign, and hence of the state, are nothing other than the acts of the individual members of the multitude. So it will

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁴³Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 120.

not merely be unjust for them to oppose their sovereign; it will actually be self-contradictory, for they will be opposing themselves.

The moral is finally drawn in a powerful summarising passage in chapter XVIII:

Because every Subject is by this Institution Author of all the Actions, and Judgments of the Sovereigne Instituted; it followes, that whatsoever he doth, it can be no injury to any of his Subjects; nor ought he to be by any of them accused of Injustice. For he that doth any thing by authority from another, doth therein no injury to him by whose authority he acteth: But by this Institution of a Common-wealth, every particular man is Author of all the Sovereigne doth; and consequently he that complaineth of injury from his Sovereigne, complaineth of that whereof he himselfe is Author; and therefore ought not to accuse any man but himselfe.¹⁴⁵

Although Hobbes recurs to this claim with evident satisfaction in a number of later passages, he stands in no need of such uncharacteristic repetitiousness.¹⁴⁶ His account of attributed action already enables him to rest his case against the radical writers of his age. The concept of the political covenant is not a means of limiting the powers of the crown; properly understood, it shows that the powers of the crown have no limits at all. The theory of attributed action lies at the heart of the politics of *Leviathan*.

REFERENCES

- Baumgold, Deborah. 1988. *Hobbes's Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. 1971. *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590–1642*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Biersteker, Thomas J. and Weber, Cynthia, eds. 1996. *State Sovereignty as Social Construct*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brett, Annabel S. 1997. *Liberty, Right and Nature: Individual Rights in Later Scholastic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burgess, Glenn. 1990. Contexts for the Writing and Publication of Hobbes's *Leviathan*. *History of Political Thought*, 11, pp. 675–702.
- Caplan, Harry, trans. 1954. *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi*. London: William Heinemann.
- Cicero, M. T. 1913. *De officiis*, trans. Walter Miller. London: William Heinemann.
- Copp, David. 1979. Collective Actions and Secondary Actions. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 16, pp. 177–86.
- Copp, David, 1980. Hobbes on Artificial Persons and Collective Actions. *The Philosophical Review*, 89, pp. 579–606.
- Digges, Dudley et al. 1642. *An Answer to a Printed Book*. Oxford: [no publisher].
- Feinberg, Joel. 1970. *Doing and Deserving: Essays in the Theory of Responsibility*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Flathman, Richard E. 1993. *Thomas Hobbes: Skepticism, Individuality, and Chastened Politics*. London: Macmillan.
- Forsyth, Murray. 1981. Thomas Hobbes and the Constituent Power of the People. *Political Studies*, 29, pp. 191–203.
- Fukuda, Arihiro. 1997. *Sovereignty and the Sword: Harrington, Hobbes, and Mixed Government in the English Civil Wars*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 124.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 136, 172; cf. also p. 121.

- Garnett, George, trans. 1994. *Vindiciae, Contra Tyrannos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gauthier, David P. 1969. *The Logic of Leviathan: the Moral and Political Theory of Thomas Hobbes*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Gierke, Otto, 1957. *Natural Law and The Theory of Society 1500 to 1800*, trans. Ernest Barker. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Goulston, Theodore. 1619. *Aristotelis de Rhetorica seu arte Dicendi Libri tres*. London: Edward Griffin.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1668. *Leviathan, sive De Materia, Forma, & Potestate Civitatis Ecclesiasticae et Civilis*. In *Thomae Hobbes Malmesburiensis Opera Philosophica Quae Latine scripsit, Omnia*. Amsterdam: Johannes Blaeu.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1839. *De Homine*. In *Thomae Hobbes malmesburiensis opera philosophica quae latine scripsit omnia*, ed. Sir William Molesworth. London: John Bohn, vol. II, pp. 1–132.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1840a. *An Answer to a Book Published by Dr. Bramhall, late Bishop of Derry; called the "Catching of the Leviathan"*. In *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Sir William Molesworth. London: John Bohn, vol. IV, pp. 279–384.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1840b. Considerations upon the Reputation, Loyalty, Manners, and Religion, of Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury. In *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Sir William Molesworth. London: John Bohn, vol. IV, pp. 409–440.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1969. *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic*, ed. Ferdinand Tönnies, second edition, introd. M. M. Goldsmith. London: Frank Cass.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1971. *Léviathan: traité de la matière, de la forme et du pouvoir de la république ecclésiastique et civile*, trans. François Tricaud. Paris: Editions Sirey.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1983. *De Cive: The Latin Version*, ed. Howard Warrender. Oxford: The Clarendon Edition, Vol. II.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1986. A Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique. In *The Rhetorics of Thomas Hobbes and Bernard Lamy*, ed. J. T. Harwood. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, pp. 33–128.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1996. *Leviathan, or The Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill*, ed. Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoekstra, S. J. 1998. *The Savage, The Citizen and the Foole: The Compulsion for Civil Society in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes*. D.Phil. Dissertation, University of Oxford.
- Hollis, Martin. 1975. My Role and its Duties. In *Nature and Conduct*, ed. R. S. Peters. London: Macmillan, pp. 180–99.
- Hollis, Martin. 1987. *The Cunning of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollis, Martin. 1996. *Reason in Action: Essays in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollis, Martin and Skinner, Quentin. 1978. Action and Context. In *The Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Supplementary vol. 52, pp. 43–69.
- Hood, F. C. 1964. *The Divine Politics of Thomas Hobbes: An Interpretation of Leviathan*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- James, Susan. 1979. *Passion and Action: The Emotions in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Jaume, Lucien. 1986. *Hobbes et l'Etat représentatif moderne*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Johnston, David. 1995. Limiting Liability: Roman Law and the Civil Law Tradition. *Chicago Kent Law Review*, 70, pp. 1515–38.
- Jonson, Ben. 1937. *Catiline his Conspiracy*. In *Ben Jonson*, vol. IV, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, pp. 409–549.
- Kussmaul, Ann. 1981. *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lessay, Franck. 1992. Le vocabulaire de la personne. In *Hobbes et son vocabulaire*, ed. Yves Charles Zarka. Paris: Vrin, pp. 155–86.

- Leyden, W. von. 1982. *Hobbes and Locke: The Politics of Freedom and Obligation*. London: Macmillan.
- Martinich, A. P. 1992. *The Two Gods of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes on Religion and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martinich, A. P. 1995. *A Hobbes Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Martinich, A. P. 1997. *Thomas Hobbes*. London: Macmillan.
- Maxwell, John. 1644. *Sacro-sancta Regum Majestatis: Or, The Sacred and Royall Prerogative of Christian Kings*. Oxford: Henry Hall.
- Mendle, Michael. 1995. *Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The political thought of the public's "privado"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mommsen, Theodor and Krueger, Paul, eds. *The Digest of Justinian*, vol. 1. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Morton, Thomas. 1643. *The Necessity of Christian Subjection*. Oxford: [no publisher].
- Oakeshott, Michael. 1975. *On Human Conduct*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Parker, Henry. 1934. *Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses [1642]*. In *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution 1638–1647*, ed. William Haller. New York: Columbia University Press, vol. II, pp. 167–213.
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Polin, Raymond. 1981. *Hobbes, Dieu et les hommes*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Pye, Christopher. 1984. The Sovereign, The Theater, and the Kingdome of Darknesse: Hobbes and the Spectacle of Power. *Representations*, 8, pp. 84–106.
- Runciman, David. 1997. *Pluralism and the Personality of the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, Paul. 1985. Hume's *Treatise* and Hobbes's *The Elements of Law*. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 46, pp. 51–63.
- Sanderson, John. 1989. 'But the People's Creatures': *The philosophical basis of the English Civil War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Shakespeare, William. 1988. *The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1978. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1988. *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his Critics*, ed. James Tully. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1990. Thomas Hobbes on the Proper Signification of Liberty. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 40, pp. 121–51.
- Sommerville, Johann. 1992. *Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context*. London: Macmillan.
- Sommerville, Johann. 1996. Lofty Science and Local Politics. In *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, ed. Tom Sorell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 246–73.
- Tricaud, François. 1982. An Investigation Concerning the Usage of the Words 'Person' and 'Persona' in the Political Treatises of Hobbes. In *Thomas Hobbes: His View of Man*, ed. J. G. van der Bend. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 89–98.
- Tuck, Richard. 1989. *Hobbes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tukiainen, Arto. 1994. The Commonwealth as a Person in Hobbes's *Leviathan*. *Hobbes Studies*, 7, pp. 44–55.
- Weimann, Robert. 1996. *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Williams, G. 1643. *Vindiciae Regum; or The Grand Rebellion*. Oxford: Henry Hall.
- Woodhouse, A. S. P., ed. 1938. *Puritanism and Liberty*. London: J. M. Dent.
- Wrigley, E. A. and Schofield, R. S. 1981. *The Population History of England 1541–1871: A Reconstruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zarka, Yves Charles. 1995. *Hobbes et la pensée politique moderne*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

The English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) is best known for his political thought, and deservedly so. His vision of the world is strikingly original and still relevant to contemporary politics. His main concern is the problem of social and political order: how human beings can live together in peace and avoid the danger and fear of civil conflict. He poses stark alternatives: we should give our obedience to an unaccountable sovereign (a person or group empowered to decide every social and political issue). Otherwise what awaits us is a state of nature that closely resembles civil war — More specifically, I am a student of Hobbes, a thinker about whom Martin never wrote. Worse still, if Martin ever had written about Hobbes he would surely have done so in tones of the sternest disapproval. For it was Hobbes who inspired Hume's classic argument to the effect that our actions must always be explained basically by reference to our desires,⁴ the very *The Journal of Political Philosophy*: Volume 7, Number 1, 1999, pp. 1–29. You do not need to be a person of religious faith to feel that Martin is with us here today.¹ I am sure that all of us who knew him personally are thinking about him; and I know that many of us have also been thinking anew in recent months about the large and important body of philosophical work he left behind.