
Italian Literature on Thomas Hobbes after the Second World War

Part I: 1946–1955

Domenico Felice

Preface

This bibliographical survey includes, in chronological order, the following items:

- (a) editions and translations of Hobbes's works;
- (b) both studies which are entirely dedicated to Hobbes's thought and those in which it is given an adequate importance, as well as university level manuals on the history of philosophy;
- (c) notes, monographs and the most significant dictionary and encyclopedia items;
- (d) Italian reviews of editions and translations of Hobbes's works and of papers entirely dedicated to him;
- (e) lastly, foreign reviews of editions and translations of Hobbes's works published in Italy and of Italian studies dedicated to the author of *Leviathan*.

The chronological limits of this bibliographical survey are due both to editorial reasons and, above all, to the need to distinguish between the studies which appeared *before* and *after* the second World War. Indeed, the numerous studies on Hobbes published in Italy at an earlier date, although of value [I am thinking, in particular, of the three chapters on Hobbes in the volume by Giacomo Laviosa, *La filosofia scientifica del diritto in Inghilterra. Studio storico-critico*, Parte I: *Da Bacone a Hume*, Clausen, Torino, 1897, pp. 131–297; Giuseppe Tarantino, *Saggio sulle idee morali e politiche di Tommaso Hobbes*, Giannini, Napoli, 1900, 144 pp.; Rodolfo Mondolfo, *Saggi per la storia della morale utilitaria*. I: *La morale di T. Hobbes*, Drucker, Verona-Padova, 1903, 278 pp.; Vittorio Beonio-Brocchieri, *Studi sulla filosofia politica di T. Hobbes*, Bocca, Torino, 1927, 190 pp.; and Adolfo Levi, *La filosofia di Tommaso Hobbes*, Società Editrice 'Dante Alighieri', Milano-Roma, 1929, 423 pp.], are however, lacking the complexity and richness of the problems present in some books which were published immediately following the War and later on. Besides, it is in these latest publications [cf., particularly, those by Norberto Bobbio, Arrigo Pacchi, Mario A. Cattaneo and by Aldo Gargani] that a real and true interest of Italian culture for Hobbes's philosophy becomes evident. This obviously does not remove the fact that my bibliographical research, begun some years ago [cf. Domenico Felice, 'Thomas Hobbes in Italia: bibliografia (1880–1981)',

Rivista di filosofia, No. 24, October 1982, pp. 440–470], may show some limitations as to its completeness. Bearing in mind this fact, I should thank scholars and readers if they would be so kind as to inform me of any omissions or errors.

1946

- [1] BIANCA, Giovanni, *Diritto e Stato nel pensiero di T. Hobbes* (Casa Editrice Libreria Humus, Napoli, 1946), 380 pp.

The author examines the essential points of H.'s political doctrine, such as the relationship between natural and civil law, between State and sovereign power, the nature of positive law, the different forms of government, the problem of liberty and the concept of punishment, etc. He singles out the very nucleus of such doctrine in the purely formal conception of the law, which is valid not for its content, but only for the fact that it is a law which is forcibly imposed (Ch. II, *Il diritto come garanzia*, pp. 43–72). He judges the problems which H.'s political construction leaves unresolved as the consequence of too rigid and abstract a position on problems (like, for example, that of liberty or that of the superiority of one form of government over another), which do not allow definitive solutions, but only ones that are historical and temporary. Furthermore, the author points out the inadequacy of a merely formal solution to the ethical and political problem; he stresses how positive law itself cannot support itself unless on the presupposition of a preceding moral or rational law (cf., in particular, pp. 319–320 and 327). However, faced with H.'s rigorous construction, the author limits himself to emphasizing the criterion of internal coherence and only where this criterion is less pronounced, does he express his own doubts and points out the errors or contradictions of the author of *Leviathan*. Bianca concludes by stating that the main interest which H.'s philosophy still holds today, lies in the concept of law as the fundamental element of society, in as much as it is considered, basically, as a guarantee (pp. 377–378).

- [2] CARABELLESE, Pantaleo, *Le obiezioni al cartesianesimo* (G. D'Anna, Messina-Città di Castello, 1946),

3 vols. Vol. II, pp. 35–40, 143–159, *passim*; Vol. III, pp. 84–88, 109–119, *passim*.

The author expounds and comments on H.'s objections to Descartes and the relative replies of the latter. He interprets H.'s philosophy as a mere sensationalism and nominalism, as a "negazione di una comune concettualità nelle persone pensanti" (Vol. II, p. 157).

[3] DE LORENZO, Giuseppe, 'Influsso di Galileo e di Kepler su Hobbes e Kant', *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Scienze fisiche e matematiche di Napoli*, s. IV, Vol. XIV, 1946–47, pp. 182–186. Also in his: *Scienza d'Occidente e sapienza d'Oriente* (R. Ricciardi, Milano–Napoli, 1953), pp. 1–6.

De Lorenzo mentions H.'s visits to Italy and his meeting with Galileo. He points out that H. was neither a disciple of Bacon nor was he influenced by Descartes, but that he applied and extended Galileo's mechanical explanation of the physical world to man's psychic, moral and social world (pp. 2–3).

1947

[4] ALBERGAMO, Francesco, *Storia della logica delle scienze esatte* (Laterza, Bari, 1947), pp. 70–74.

Part III, § 19. *Hobbes: riduzione della matematica alla fisica*, pp. 70–71; § 20. *Valore simbolico della matematica*, pp. 71–72; § 21. *Carattere convenzionale dei principi matematici*, pp. 72–73; § 22. *Apriorismo della scienza della natura*, pp. 73–74.

[5] ALFIERI, Vittorio Enzo, *Autorità e libertà nelle moderne teorie della politica*, Vol. I: *Dal Medioevo all'Illuminismo* (Marzorati, Milano, 1947), pp. 239–252.

The author examines H.'s solution to the problem of the relationship between authority and liberty. He affirms that among the philosophers of the age of absolutism who tackled the political problem, only H. supported authority against liberty and gave a theoretical justification to the absolute power of the State (pp. 239–240). Furthermore, he observes that the "musa ispiratrice" of H. was the "paura della vita" and it is for this reason that he imagined a society in which men were laid in the motionless rigidity of death (p. 248). Alfieri concludes by saying that he agrees with J. W. Gough's opinion (*The Social Contract. A Critical Study of Its Development*, Oxford, 1936, p. 107), according to which the social contract is not fundamental for H.'s political theory, even if the treatment which the author of *Leviathan* gave to it was of immense importance in the history of contractualism (pp. 251–252).

[6] BAGOLINI, Luigi, *La originalità di Hume rispetto al pensiero di Hobbes*. In his: *Esperienza giuridica e politica nel pensiero di David Hume* (Circolo Giuridico dell'Università, Siena, 1947), pp. 74–82. (New edition: Giappichelli, Torino, 1967).

The author points out that the reason which Hobbes attributes to man in the state of nature is a "puro potere individuale empirico" on the basis of which Hobbes's own distinction between *jus* and *lex* is lost (p. 80). He maintains, moreover, that Hobbes's natural law is in no way a law, but a simple, prejudicial power, which is identified by the very individual action through which it is revealed and that, consequently, Hobbes finds he is faced with the difficulty of having to explain the contract without the transfer of rights, precisely because of the lack of precontractual rights, however they may be defined (p. 81). Finally, he affirms that Hume overcomes such difficulties, taking up, however, and treating in a new way and on a different level of theoretical considerations from the contractualist level, some elements expressed in Hobbes's philosophy, such as the individualist exigency (pp. 81–82).

[7] BOBBIO, Norberto, *Tommaso Hobbes*. In his: *Il diritto naturale nel secolo XVIII* (Giappichelli, Torino, 1947), pp. 18–26.

Bobbio illustrates briefly H.'s conception of natural law, emphasizing in particular, how in H., the moral and political problem enters a phase of rationalistic reduction, of which, still today, more mature or bold an expression cannot be conceived (p. 19).

[8] NARDO, Giuseppe, *Spinoza. Il pensiero politico e religioso in rapporto con Hobbes* (Libreria 'Italia' Editrice, Roma, 1947), 91 pp.

The author proposes to vindicate the originality of Spinoza's political ideas as regards H.'s. For this purpose, he shows how Spinoza's general, philosophical principles, are profoundly different from those of H. and how from such diversity it follows that, firstly, for one, unlike for the other, the transfer of natural right to civil power is partial (p. 11); secondly, that the Dutch philosopher, besides admitting to right and to the natural and rational society of the English philosopher, also accepts the existence of a right and of an intellectual or divine society (p. 15); thirdly, that in Spinoza's system, the social contract involves an elevation of the individual from the state of nature to the intellectual or divine society, whereas, in H.'s system, the contract is a simple transition from one condition to another both placed on the level of egoism (pp. 59–60); lastly, that in the opinion of the author of *Tractatus theologico-politicus*, the best form of government is the democratic republic, while for the author of *Leviathan*, it is absolute monarchy (pp. 62–63).

1948

- [9] ABBAGNANO, Nicola, *Storia della filosofia* (Utet, Torino, 1948), Vol. II, pp. 192–199. (Second edition entirely re-arranged: Utet, Torino, 1963, Vol. II, pp. 211–229.)

The author expounds, concisely, H.'s natural and civil philosophy. He interprets H.'s materialism as a methodological materialism (p. 194; p. 218 in the 1963 edition). Such an interpretation is also supported by Abbagnano under the item *Materialismo* in his *Dizionario di filosofia* (Utet, Torino, 1961; second edition revised and extended: Utet, Torino, 1971).

- [10] BOBBIO, Norberto, review of G. Bianca, *Diritto e Stato nel pensiero di T. Hobbes* (Casa Editrice Libreria Humus, Napoli, 1946), *Rivista di filosofia* (1948), 73–75.

Bobbio's conclusive opinion is that Bianca has made a considerable contribution to the interpretation and clarification of H.'s political thought, but that this contribution would certainly have been more effective and useful if it had been written in a more concise form, in a less exegetic but more systematic book and, above all, if the author had not totally ignored the critical literature on H. (p. 75).

- [11] CARLINI, Armando, review of G. Bianca, *Diritto e Stato nel pensiero di T. Hobbes* (Casa Editrice Libreria Humus, Napoli, 1946), *Giornale di metafisica* (1948), 60–62.

Carlini observes in particular that, besides the lack of a sense of history, Bianca should have laid more emphasis on another defect, which is also fundamental, that of H.'s political construction, that is to say its extrinsic or mechanical nature, which is the reason why the spiritual meaning of human actions is never penetrated (p. 61).

- [12] GARIN, Eugenio, review of T. Hobbes, *Elementi filosofici sul cittadino*, ed. by Norberto Bobbio (Utet, Torino, 1948), *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* (1948), 391–392.

The author affirms that H. has found in Bobbio a translator and illustrator "di prim'ordine" (p. 391).

- [13] HOBBS, Thomas *Elementi filosofici sul cittadino*, ed. by Norberto Bobbio (Utet, Torino, 1948). Second edition revised and extended in *Opere politiche di Thomas Hobbes*, ed. by Norberto Bobbio (Utet, Torino, 1959), 576 pp.

The 1948 edition contains the first integral Italian translation of *De Cive*, to which was added, in the second edition

of 1959, the translation of the *Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student of the Common Laws of England*. The translations are based on the texts published by W. Molesworth (1839–1845) and are complete with ample, accurate interpretative and historical notes, as well as biographical and bibliographical ones.

In the *Introduzione* (2nd ed., pp. 7–41), Bobbio examines H.'s theory in its historical and political context, pointing out that it is "la prima teoria moderna dello Stato moderno" (p. 7), in that it interprets and expresses both the processes of unification characteristic of the modern State: that is, political unification by the elimination of State and Church dualism and the contrast between King and Parliament, and legal unification by the proclamation of the dependence of the norms of common law on those issued by the sovereign (pp. 16–17).

The author considers *De Cive* as the most organic and homogeneous among H.'s political works. To be more precise, he maintains that *Leviathan* is a far richer and more powerful work, but that *De Cive* in comparison, acquires in precision and rigour what it loses in complexity and vigour. *Leviathan* reveals better H.'s greatness and personal genius, *De Cive*, on the other hand, brings out the acuteness of his intelligence, his fondness of precision, his subtly logical mind and thus appears, in the end, symmetrical and measured in its different parts, concise and rapid in reasoning and more incisive and convincing. *De Cive* is "veramente il trionfo dell'esatto argomentare, del ragionamento serrato, dello spirito geometrico", and still today maintains its unreplaceable position in the history of political doctrine, even when compared with *Leviathan*, which recasts the same material with greater freedom and richness (p. 34).

As far as the *Dialogue* is concerned, Bobbio says that it is a continuous, intense discussion with Sir Edward Coke, from which H. takes the opportunity of re-asserting the political theses dearest to him and, above all, of expounding his interpretation of common law, which he identifies with natural reason or equity, of which however, the sole authorized interpreter is not the judge but the sovereign. In such a way, H. allows no other positive law to subsist alongside written law; only natural law survives, but it acquires legal validity by the will of the sovereign alone. In the taking of his stand lies the historical value of the *Dialogue*, the last witness of a way of thinking pursued coherently throughout three decades which are among the most decisive in Great Britain's civil and cultural history (p. 40).

- [14] NICOLINI, Fausto, 'Di alcuni rapporti ideali tra il Vico e lo Hobbes con qualche riferimento al Machiavelli', *Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana di Napoli*, n.s., Vol. I, 1947–48, pp. 25–48. Also in: Mario Praz

(ed.), *English Miscellany. A Symposium of History, Literature and the Arts*, No. 1 (1950), 43–70.

The paper deals, in great detail, with the problem of the relationship between Vico and H., already tackled by the author in the first place in 'Vico, Hobbes e una postilla inedita alla Scienza Nuova' (*Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana di Napoli*, Vol. LXI, 1942, pp. 238–249).

In it, Nicolini points out, first of all, that H.'s works were little known to Neapolitan scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and that Vico, instead of drawing directly from the writings of the author of *Leviathan*, in most, if not in all cases, availed himself of scarce, inaccurate and often tendentious examples of H.'s doctrine which had been presented by Giorgio Pasch da Danzica (1661–1707) in *De novis inventis, quorum accuratiori cultui facem praetulit antiquitas* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1700) which was antipathetic to H.'s philosophy (pp. 43–44).

Nicolini then stresses numerous analogies and divergencies between the *Scienza Nuova* and H.'s philosophy. Among the first, he emphasizes the similarities between H.'s *bellum omnium contra omnes* and the "erramento ferino" of Vico's primitive humanity; between the explanations which both philosophers give as being the origins of religion (the ignorance of secondary causes, fear, the exchange of accidental with prognostic events); between H.'s distinction of knowledge in knowledge of fact and knowledge of the consequence of one affirmation to another and the one contained in Vico's tenth *Degnità* between "scienza del vero" and "coscienza del certo" (pp. 45–47); lastly, between Vico's famous progression according to which men "prima sentono senz'avvertire", then "avvertiscono con animo perturbato e commosso", finally they "riflettono con mente pura" and the succession of the first three chapters of *Leviathan*, dedicated respectively to sense, imagination and the linkage of images (p. 65).

Among the divergencies, on the other hand, Nicolini stresses the absence in H. of the idea, central in Vico, of the "provvidenzialità immanente della storia"; the difference between the two philosophers as regards the concept of art, which is not in the least examined by H. and, furthermore, music and poetry, which are considered expressions of reflected knowledge, whereas for Vico they are the most elementary forms of intuitive knowledge; the diversity of ideas on history, which for the former is "meramente filologica" knowledge, whereas for the latter it is philosophical and philosophical knowledge (pp. 47–48); finally, the fact that in H.'s philosophy, the merely utilitarian values predominate, while in Vico's, they prevail over these intellectual and moral values (pp. 53–55).

1949

- [15] DROETTO, Antonio, review of G. Bianca, *Diritto e Stato nel pensiero di T. Hobbes* (Casa Editrice Libreria Humus, Napoli, 1946); *Rivista internazionale di filosofia del diritto* (1949), 340–342.

Droetto criticizes Bianca's book for its prolixity and, above all, for the absence of a comparison between H.'s political doctrine and those doctrines immediately prior and succeeding it (pp. 341–342).

1950

- [16] BIANCA, Giovanni, 'La categoria del diritto nel pensiero di Hobbes', *Revue internationale de philosophie*, No. 14 (1950), 432–451.

The author begins the treatment of the subject by observing that H.'s concept of law not only refers to the particular conditions of the historical age in which he lived and developed his ideas, but that it can still be considered valid today and perhaps will remain so, always and in all places (p. 433).

H. considered law fundamentally as an obligation which substitutes the free conduct of citizens with a supreme categorical imperative. Such an obligation requires, therefore, an understanding between individuals so as to avoid the harm and dangers of discord (p. 435). In such a way, law appears to be purely formal and its execution is based on the coercibility of the State, to which all individuals must alienate their own right to govern themselves (pp. 438–39). After having outlined the most important points of the progression of H.'s political ideas, the author emphasizes the impossibility of a conciliation between liberty and law and the human aspect of H.'s law, in as much as it is a free creation of man and in that it exists only for human ends (pp. 444–445). The author explains lastly, the necessary superiority of form over the content of law as it is intended in H.'s conception (pp. 449–451).

- [17] DEL VECCHIO, Giorgio, *Hobbes*. In his: *Storia della filosofia del diritto* (Giuffrè, Milano, 1950), pp. 41–43. (Second edition: Giuffrè, Milano, 1958, pp. 44–46).

Del Vecchio criticizes H. for having refused to acknowledge that altruism is just as natural as egoism and for having constructed a political system, which has the tendency of satisfying only the exigency for order, to the prejudice of liberty (p. 46).

1951

- [18] CASELLATO, Sante, *L'utilitarismo politico di Tommaso Hobbes*. In his: *G. Stuart Mill e l'utilitarismo inglese* (Cedam, Padova, 1951), pp. 39–61.

The author analyzes, in its most essential points, H.'s ethical and political doctrine. He affirms that H.'s philosophy is the starting-point of modern English utilitarianism and that H.'s psychology is not a materialistic one, but "semplicemente" mechanical (pp. 39–41). Furthermore, he observes that the man of whom H. speaks, is not the single man who might behave in one way or even in another, but the man who *always* behaves in the same way, hence obeying a law which surpasses and transcends him and which makes him an "elemento del meccanismo etico e del meccanismo universale" (p. 42). The author then points out that in H.'s doctrine, the relationships between individuals are relationships of force and that the State arises out of the predomination, in the system of forces, of one force over the others. Therefore, at the origin of H.'s State, there is not, according to Casellato, a legal criterion, but a "fisico e naturalistico" criterion (pp. 50–51). The author observes, finally, that H.'s political construction is based on a "volontarismo a parte Dei di tipo scotista", in that the will of God on earth, or of Leviathan, is the law and criterion of the good and evil and just and unjust (p. 58).

- [19] GALIZIA, Mario, *Tommaso Hobbes*. In his: *La teoria della sovranità dal Medioevo alla Rivoluzione francese* (Giuffrè, Milano, 1951), pp. 199–212.

Galizia expounds, concisely, H.'s political doctrine. He concludes by observing that notwithstanding some limits, H.'s contribution to the evolution of concepts of State and sovereignty has been "essenziale" (p. 212).

- [20] HOBBS, Thomas, 'Considerazioni sulla reputazione, sulla lealtà, sulle buone maniere e sulla religione', ed. by Norberto Bobbio, *Rivista di filosofia* (1951), 399–423.

Translation of the *Considerations upon the Reputation, Loyalty, Manners and Religion*. In the *Introduzione* (pp. 399–402), Bobbio mentions the main points of the polemic between H. and J. Wallis and stresses the philosophical and political interest of H.'s work, in addition to its biographical importance.

- [21] MATTAI, Giuseppe, 'Il radicalismo antipersonalista di T. Hobbes', *Salesianum* (1951), 497–509.

The author examines some aspects of H.'s political doctrine, such as the relationship between natural and civil law and between State and Church. He concludes by remarking that

the price demanded by H. in order to obtain peace within the civil society is not only very high, but also ethically unacceptable. The coin that, in fact, has to be placed in the hands of H.'s sovereign, is, in Mattai's opinion, the human being himself in his highest values, of conscience (discernment of good and evil) and of religion (discernment of what is the will of God and what is not) (p. 508).

- [22] SAINATI, Vittorio, *Thomas Hobbes*. In: *Enciclopedia cattolica* (Città del Vaticano, 1951), Vol. VI, 1450–1452.

Sainati states that Descartes's rationalism had a lasting influence on H.'s ideas, modifying their original Baconian orientation (p. 1450).

1952

- [23] BAGOLINI, Luigi, *La critica di Smith contro le posizioni di Hobbes e di Hutcheson*. In his: *La simpatia nella morale e nel diritto. Aspetti del pensiero politico di Adam Smith* (Zuffi, Bologna, 1952), pp. 19–29. (New edition: Giappichelli, Torino, 1966, pp. 23–34.)

The author examines Smith's principle of the sympathy in relation to the doctrines of H. and Hutcheson, explaining how such a principle detaches itself polemically and structurally both from H.'s *self-love* and from Hutcheson's *moral sense*.

- [24] HOBBS, Thomas, *Il pensiero politico. Pagine scelte da 'Leviathan', 'De Corpore', 'De Homine', 'De Cive'*, introduction, translation and notes by Renato Tisato (Canova, Treviso, 1952), 250 pp.

The *Introduzione* (pp. 5–56) is divided into two parts. In the first, Tisato offers a brief reconstruction of the problem of the State from St. Augustine to Grotius. In the second, he briefly mentions H.'s life and illustrates the basic aspects of his ideas. He observes, in particular, that H., in contrast with his phenomenalism, supports a dogmatic form of realism (p. 41) and, furthermore, that what is positive in H.'s conception of the State as absolute sovereignty, is invalidated by the confusion between absolutism and despotism (p. 50).

1953

- [25] BOBBIO, Norberto, review of John Bowle, *Hobbes and his Critics. A Study in Seventeenth Century Constitutionalism* (Jonathan Cape, London, 1951); *Rivista di filosofia* (1953), 212–214.

Bobbio remarks that if H. had really been, as, in his opinion, Bowle is inclined to think, more a philosopher than a politician, more a theoretical anticipator and a prince of the heretics than a "statesmanlike writer", one would not be able to understand how his doctrine has remained and is still looked upon today, as one of the pillars in the history of political thought. The importance of H. and, consequently, the reason for which, he, unlike his critics of the 17th century, is still alive and relevant today, are to be found, according to Bobbio, above all, in two points: on the one hand, in the fact that H.'s political theory is the first rationalist arrangement of problems of the State and the citizen; on the other hand, in the fact that it represents the first and already full awareness of the birth of the centralized State, or rather, of the monopolization of law by the power of the State (pp. 213–214).

[26] CRINÒ, Anna Maria, *Thomas Hobbes*. In his: *Antologia del pensiero politico inglese* (F. De Silva, Firenze, 1953), pp. 65–85.

Biography (pp. 65–68); bibliography (pp. 68–69); reproduction of Chapters XIII and XVIII from *Leviathan*.

[27] D'ALESSANDRO, Vittorio, 'Il problema pedagogico nel pensiero filosofico e politico di Hobbes', *Atti dell'Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo*, s. IV, Vol. XIII, No. 2 (1952–53), 5–231. (New edition with the title *Hobbes filosofo dell'educazione*: La Nuova Italia, Firenze, 1968, 219 pp.)

The paper is divided into two parts. In the first (*La filosofia metodologica di Hobbes*, pp. 11–104, ed. 1968), the author examines the philosophy of H. and, in the light of a reading of pragmatistic inspiration, he seeks to exceed the preceding unilateral interpretations: H., in his opinion, surpassed the antithesis of rationalism and empiricism by attributing to reason a theoretical and practical function (whence the definition of philosophy as a science of human action in the reality of the world) (pp. 47–56). The author also stresses how the reform of philosophy effected by H. shows more modern elements than in Bacon, Galileo and Descartes, although it is contrasted by the adherence of the author of *Leviathan* to the currents of traditional thought (in particular, pp. 62–64). The second part (*La concezione educativa ed etico-politica*, pp. 105–219) obtains, from these premises, the elements to analyze the originality and contradictions of H.'s pedagogical theory and stresses, besides the unity of ethical, political and educational problems, other important aspects, such as the relationship between determinism and liberty, the analogy between the inventive and the didactic method, the autonomy of the educator State as regards religion and Church, etc. The book, finally, remarks on the influence exercised by H. on the illuminists, who, however,

repudiated his political absolutism and it even speaks of a *tragic modernity* of the author of *Leviathan*, not because the world today needs absolutist forms of political organization, but because it needs, according to what Kant already predicted, an international order founded on laws and sustained by force, capable of assuring, effectively, peace among nations (pp. 218–219).

[28] PIZZARELLI, Pietro, review of T. Hobbes, *Il pensiero politico. Pagine scelte da 'Leviathan', 'De Corpore', 'De Homine', 'De Cive'*, introduction, translation and notes by Renato Tisato (Canova, Treviso, 1952); *Sophia*, Nos. 3–4 (1953), 89–90.

The author states that the anthology edited by Tisato is useful and rich in observations (p. 90).

[29] TISATO, Renato, review of Raymond Polin, *Politique et Philosophie chez Thomas Hobbes* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1953); *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* (1953), 619–624.

After having summarized the content of the book, Tisato observes that Polin's merit is, above all, in having given us an idea of H. which is anything but conventional; a living H., anticipator of our problems; a H. who proposes, for such problems, extremely up to date solutions (p. 622). The author then makes some critical considerations, regarding, above all, the interpretation which Polin gives of H.'s theory of language and of the public person. He concludes, asserting that the book is a "strumento prezioso" only for those who, already familiar with H., intend to read his works again (p. 624).

1954

[30] BOBBIO, Norberto, *Legge naturale e legge civile nella filosofia politica di Hobbes*. In: *Studi in memoria di Gioele Solari* (Ramella, Torino, 1954), pp. 61–101. Also in N. Bobbio, *Da Hobbes a Marx. Saggi di storia della filosofia* (Morano, Napoli, 1965), pp. 11–49.

The paper contains a detailed study of the relationship between natural and civil law in H.'s political doctrine. According to the author, H. can with good reason be considered a positivist and even as the initiator and anticipator of legal positivism, principally for the following reasons: firstly, to H., natural laws have validity and are obligatory only when respect of them brings benefit rather than damage, which occurs only when they are transformed into civil laws (pp. 25–26); secondly, in the opinion of the author of *Leviathan*, positive law does not limit itself to attributing legal validity to natural law, but determines and

specifies the content of it: in fact, H. stated, in a celebrated passage of *De Cive* (VI, 16), that, although natural law establishes that one must not commit theft, homicide or adultery, etc., it is up to positive law to determine what theft, homicide and adultery, etc., actually are (pp. 28–29); thirdly, even if H. declares that natural laws are obligatory whenever positive laws are silent and are referred to in the case of lacunae, he affirms that the interpretation of natural law itself – which is the only act which gives it validity – is up to the authority of the State, personified by the judge (pp. 31–35); lastly, to H. natural law has, essentially, the fundamental task, through the third law of nature (*pacta sunt servanda*) above all, of justifying the absolute value of positive law: indeed, H.'s natural laws do not prescribe a given content, but merely establish that a positive order must be constituted which will have, it alone and with its own strength, a precise content (p. 47). In conclusion, according to Bobbio, H. seeks, in every circumstance, to throw back natural law and to demonstrate its fundamental inconsistency: it is for this reason that he may be rightly considered as the initiator of a monistic conception of law or of a conception which does not recognize natural law as a system of law superior to the positive law system (p. 49).

[31] BOBBIO, Norberto, 'Formalismo giuridico e formalismo etico', *Rivista di filosofia* (1954), 264–270. Also in his: *Studi sulla teoria generale del diritto* (Giappichelli, Torino, 1955), pp. 145–162.

The paper is divided into three sections. The first puts forward some arguments to show how the formal theory of law is different from the formal conception of justice. The second illustrates the two theories in which, according to the author, the characteristic elements of the legal conception of justice can principally be grouped: that is, the theory of *peace* (or *order*) as the exclusive purpose of law and that of *coherence* as the legal virtue above all. In the third part, finally, the author goes on to make a comparison between H.'s philosophy and Kelsen's theory. He affirms that in both, the legal conception of justice can be found elaborated, but that while in H.'s philosophy the value of peace is an absolute and supreme value, in Kelsen's theory it is one of the possible values, as relative as the others. Therefore, the difference between H. and Kelsen, concludes Bobbio, is the difference between a rationalist of the 17th Century in whom, behind the methodological rationalism, appears a rational conception of the universe, and a contemporary scientist for whom reason is a "tecnica dell'indagine e della convivenza sociale" (p. 270).

[32] VIANO, Carlo Augusto, review of Raymond Polin, *Politique et Philosophie chez Thomas Hobbes* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1953); *Rivista di filosofia* (1954), 214–218.

Viano starts off by defining the book as a "solida opera di storiografia filosofica", extremely useful to the expert and also, with the exception of some parts, to whoever wishes to approach the author of *Leviathan* for the first time (p. 215). He then summarizes the content of the book and discusses Polin's principal argument, according to which H.'s philosophy consists substantially of a form of humanism. Viano concludes observing that all analyses that Polin makes of H.'s writings and all the details he contributes are acceptable, but that they should change target; i.e. that they should be considered in a naturalist rather than a humanist context. In his opinion, in fact, H. attempted not to let the human world emerge from nature, but to reduce such a world to nature (p. 218).

1955

[33] DI CARLO, Eugenio, 'Il pensiero pedagogico di Hobbes', *Sophia* (1955), 360–361.

The author briefly illustrates the paper by V. D'Alessandro on H.'s philosophy and political and pedagogical principles (cf. No. 27) and on the whole judges it favourably.

[34] HOBBS, Thomas, *Il Leviatano*, ed. by Roberto Giammanco (Utet, Torino, 1955), 2 vols., 804 pp. (Reprinted: Utet, Torino, 1965.)

The two volumes contain the second integral Italian translation of *Leviathan* (the first, edited by Mario Vinciguerra, was published in 1911–12 by the Casa Editrice Laterza of Bari). The translation is based on the 4th reprint of the critical edition of the *Leviathan* edited by W. G. Pogson Smith (The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1947) and it is complete with brief historical notes, as well as with a biobibliographical note.

In the *Introduzione* (pp. 5–31), Giammanco sets H.'s political doctrine in its historical context, examining it in the light of the polemics from which it originated and of the criticism which was made about it. He observes, in particular, that *Leviathan* is a splendid attempt to put a conception of the world into operation, a conception which derives its character of absoluteness from the relativism which is its basis (p. 29).

[35] SIMONETTI, Maria, 'Possibili influenze di Hobbes sul pensiero pascaliano', *Humanitas* (1955), 327–338.

Simonetti makes a comparison between some passages of Pascal's *Pensées* and the 1649 French edition of *De Cive*, on the basis of which he believes he may conclude that Pascal, even if within precise limits, was influenced by H.'s philosophy (p. 338).

- [36] VISALBERGHI, Aldo, review of V. D'Alessandro, 'Il problema pedagogico nel pensiero filosofico e politico di Hobbes', *Atti dell'Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo*, s. IV, Vol. XIII, No. 2 (1952-53), 5-231; *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* (1955), 301.

The author affirms that the paper by D'Alessandro is "ottimo", but that it bears a title which only becomes it in part, given that only one or two chapters are really dedicated to strictly pedagogical and didactic problems.

(To be continued)

*Istituto di Filosofia della Facoltà
di Lettere e Filosofia dell' Univ. di Bologna*

Announcement

The Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein Society is pleased to announce the

TENTH INTERNATIONAL WITTGENSTEIN SYMPOSIUM

from August 18 (arrival) to August 25, 1985 (departure), in Kirchberg/Wechsel (Lower Austria, near Vienna). The theme of this year's symposium will be *'The Tasks of Contemporary Philosophy'*. The following sections are planned:

1. Wittgenstein
2. Philosophy as the foundation and methodology of the sciences and humanities
3. Philosophy as logic and critique of language
4. Our moral responsibility for human beings and the environment
 - (a) in science and technology
 - (b) in economics and politics
5. The problem of a contemporary metaphysics
6. Is philosophy a substitute for religion and 'Weltanschauung'?

A seminar on Austrian Philosophy will be part of the programme of the conference.

Scholars wishing to present a paper on a topic which falls within the above themes (papers for sections 2-6 need not be connected with Wittgenstein's philosophy) should request an abstract style sheet from either the President of the Austrian Wittgenstein Society, Dr. Adolf Hübner, Markt 234, A-2880 Kirchberg am Wechsel, Austria, or Professor Werner Leinfellner, University of Nebraska, Department of Philosophy, Lincoln, NE 68508, U.S.A. The deadline for receipt of abstracts is June 15, 1985. Should more papers be offered than can be accepted, selection will be by decision of the organizing committee. Contributors will be informed of the committee's decision not later than July 15, 1985. Official languages will be English and German.

Those planning to attend the conference should contact Dr. Hübner at the above address for further information as soon as possible. Conference fees will be 1,200 Austrian Schillings for non-students and 400 Austrian Schillings for students.