Hobbes and the Cavendish Circle: Intellectual Networks in the Seventeenth Century

Introduction

Oberto Marrama | ORCID: 0000-0003-3700-5211

Department of Philosophy and Cultural Heritage, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, Italy

oberto.marrama@unive.it

Faculty of Humanities, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

oberto.marrama@oulu.fi

Pietro Daniel Omodeo | ORCID: 0000-0003-3561-1154

Department of Philosophy and Cultural Heritage, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice Italy

pietrodaniel.omodeo@unive.it

Abstract

An introduction to the special issue on Hobbes and the Cavendish Circle: Intellectual Networks in the Seventeenth Century.

Keywords

Hobbes, Cavendish Circle, William Cavendish, Charles Cavendish, Margaret Cavendish, intellectual networks, history of philosophy, history of science

1. Background

This special issue of *Hobbes Studies* gathers selected contributions that investigate ways in which philosophical and scientific ideas were discussed and circulated within and through the so-called "Cavendish Circle" – the cosmopolitan network of European thinkers that revolved around William

Cavendish, 1st Earl, Marquess, and eventually Duke of Newcastle (1593-1676) and his family, via direct relationships of patronage and indirect learned exchanges.[1] More specifically, this collection aims to shed light on the role of Thomas Hobbes within this intellectual network and how aspects of his philosophy influenced, and were in turn influenced by, the system of knowledge circulation and knowledge production fostered by William and his brother, Sir Charles Cavendish (1591-1653).

A seminal collection of studies, which was among the first works that drew significant attention to the Cavendish Circle and the role of the Cavendish family as patrons of intellectuals, scientists and artists, is the special issue "The Cavendish Circle," edited by Timothy Raylor, which appeared in *The Seventeenth Century* in 1994.[2] Other important works followed, which contributed

---

[1] The Cavendish Circle is also referred to as the "Welbeck Academy" (from the name of Wiliam Cavendish's family mansion) and the "Newcastle Circle." Although these are all informal labels adopted by scholars, we opted for the first for two reasons: one the one hand, it involves no geographical reference, therefore emphasizing the cosmopolitan and international nature of the circle and the group of people involved in it; on the other hand, it does not refer to a title that only applies to William Cavendish, and which would implicitly obscure the roles of Sir Charles Cavendish and Margaret Cavendish in this network. For further considerations on the use of these terms, see Noel Malcolm, "A Summary Biography of Hobbes," in *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, ed. Tom Sorell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 13-44 (22-3); repr. in Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 1-26 (11).

[2] "The Cavendish Circle," ed. Timothy Raylor, special issue, *The Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994). Prior to this, articles which helped establish the relevance of the brothers William and Charles Cavendish as pivots for interactions between European philosophers and scientists are Helen Hervey's "Hobbes and Descartes in the Light of Some Unpublished Letters of the Correspondence between Sir Charles Cavendish and Dr. John Pell," *Osiris* 10 (1952): 67-90, and Jean Jacquot's two-

to understanding, analyzing and contextualizing the extent of the interactions among members of the circle, and their relevance for the development of philosophical and scientific thought.[3] The more the scholarship advanced in disentangling the net of intellectual relations in which the Cavendishes were involved, the more it became clear that the Cavendish Circle was not just the informal means through which learned personalities got in contact with one another, and through which ideas and information were passed around among philosophers and scientists; it was a true laboratory of ideas, enhancing the intellectual production of those involved in it and capable of promoting philosophical and scientific agendas.

It is with this in mind that, thirty years after the publication of "The Cavendish Circle," the editors of this *Hobbes Studies* issue organized the workshop "The Cavendish Circle: Philosophical Networks in the 17th Century" at Ca' Foscari University of Venice. The wide-ranging questions animating the event were the following: to what extent and how did Hobbes's philosophical production depend on his interactions with members of the Cavendish family? And what was, in turn,

---

part article "Sir Charles Cavendish and His Learned Friends: A Contribution to the History of Scientific Relations Between England and the Continent in the Earlier Part of the 17th Century. I. Before the Civil War," *Annals of Science* 8 (1952): 13-27, and "Sir Charles Cavendish and His Learned Friends … II. The Years of Exile," *Annals of Science* 8 (1952): 175-91.

[3] A formidable example of this kind is Noel Malcolm and Jacqueline Stedall's *John Pell (1611-1685) and his Correspondence with Sir Charles Cavendish* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005). Justin Begley's "Margaret Cavendish, The Last Natural Philosopher" (PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2016), depicts Margaret Cavendish as an active member of the circle, and shows how her works were discussed by her contemporaries and influenced by her interactions with learned intellectuals. For a recent collection of studies on the Cavendish family and their involvement in the cultural milieu of seventeenth-century Europe, see also Lisa Hopkins and Tom Rutter, eds., *A Companion to the Cavendishes* (Leeds: Arc Humanities Press, 2020).

the impact of Hobbes's philosophy within Cavendish's household and their intellectual entourage? This special issue is in large part the result of conversations held on that occasion: early versions of two papers included in this collection – namely those of Timothy Raylor and Stephen Clucas – were presented in the workshop, and discussions with all participants in the event greatly helped narrow down the topics to tackle in a prospective publication and the general methodological framework to adopt. Among other things, a special interest emerged in exploring the reception of Hobbes's philosophy by Margaret Cavendish (1623-1673) – an aspect covered here by Mary Jo MacDonald's and Marcus Adams's invited contributions to the issue. Margaret, the second wife of William and author of philosophical treatises, plays, novels and poems, has been the focus of extraordinary scholarly attention in the past few years.[4]

It also became apparent that the topic of the workshop, and of this special issue, represented an optimal case study for a methodological approach that has gained ground in studies in the history of science. This combines the investigation of the means of knowledge circulation with the analysis of the local contexts of knowledge production, in order to situate and understand the historical development of scientific theories. This approach can indeed be fruitfully used to shed light on the

[4] Turning points for a reconsideration of Margaret Cavendish's philosophy and intellectual output were Susan James's article "The Philosophical Innovations of Margaret Cavendish," *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 7 (1999): 219-44, and Eileen O'Neill's influential edition of Cavendish's *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001 [1668]). Until then, a widespread opinion around Margaret Cavendish was, as exemplified in A. P. Martinich's terms, that she "was also a philosopher, although not a very good one" (A. P. Martinich, *Hobbes: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 317), although there were exceptions (for instance, Sarah Hutton, "In Dialogue with Thomas Hobbes: Margaret Cavendish's Natural Philosophy," *Women's Writing* 4 (1997): 421-32). This earlier negative assessment has been definitely dissipated by much recent scholarship.

two-way influence connecting Hobbes's philosophy with the context of the Cavendish household – a context which included, among other things, the Cavendishes' own philosophical and scientific interests, their system of personal relationships, their note-taking and correspondence practices, and the consequent requests and queries to members of their entourage.

2. Hobbes, the Cavendish Circle, and the Importance of Intellectual Networks in the Seventeenth Century

A decisive step towards establishing novel research lines concerning the centrality of intellectual networks for our understanding of the history of science was James A. Secord's lecture "Knowledge in Transit," delivered in 2004 at the fifth joint meeting of the "Three Societies" (the British Society for the History of Science, the Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science/La Société Canadienne d'Histoire et de Philosophie des Sciences, and the History of Science Society). By stressing the epistemological relevance of the practical means that determine the circulation of knowledge, Secord turned the free-market zeitgeist of the early 2000s – when globalization was becoming the dominant social and economic model for much of the Western world – into a research program which, since then, has brought about important results.[5] Drawing on studies on networks reaching back to antiquity, new investigations have thus explored scientists' interactions, philosophical correspondences, and intertextual links, also by creating ad hoc databases which allow graphic representations of these interconnections.[6] Studies in the history of early modern science have

[5] The revised version of Secord's lecture was published in James A. Secord, "Knowledge in Transit," *Isis* 95 (2004): 654-72; repr. in *The History of Science in a World of Readers*, ed. Dagmar Schäfer and Angela N. H. Craeger (Berlin: Edition Open Access, 2019), 143-63.

[6] For instance, see Irad Malkin, *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Matteo Valleriani et al., "The Emergence of Epistemic Communities in the *Sphaera* Corpus: Mechanisms of Knowledge Evolution," *Journal of Historical*

been significantly affected by this new wave. Inquiries into weak and strong ties within and between networks of learned correspondents and academic institutions have produced both broad overviews and nuanced micro-historical reconstructions.[7] A traditional field of inquiry that has been revived concerns the so-called *Respublica Litterarum*, the self-aware endeavour of Western intellectuals in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to establish a cosmopolitan, international community of learned people interacting with one another across long distances.[8] And although the Cavendish Circle, with its practices, connections, shared interests and "unofficial codes of conduct" can be rightfully included in the Republic of Letters,[9] its role and historical import in it has not been sufficiently acknowledged and investigated yet.

Network Research 3 (2019): 50-91; Roberto Lalli, Riaz Howey, and Dirk Wintergrün, "The Dynamics of Collaboration Networks and the History of General Relativity, 1925-1970," *Scientometrics* 122 (2020): 1129-70.

[7] See, for example, David S. Lux and Harold J. Cook, "Closed Circles or Open Networks?: Communicating at a Distance during the Scientific Revolution," *History of Science* 36 (1998): 179-211. Among the studies on early modern thought inspired by Lux and Cook's work, see Pietro Daniel Omodeo, "Asymmetries of Symbolic Capital in Seventeenth-Century Scientific Transactions: Placentinus's Cometary Correspondence with Hevelius and Lubieniecki," in *The Institutionalization of Science in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Giulia Giannini and Mordechai Feingold (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 52-79.

[8] See Dan Edelstein et al., "Historical Research in a Digital Age: Reflections from the Mapping the Republic of Letters Project," *The American Historical Review* 122 (2017): 400-24.

[9] Justin Begley, "Confessional Disputes in the Republic of Letters: Susan Du Verger and Margaret Cavendish," *The Seventeenth Century* 34 (2017): 181-207 (182). See also Malcolm and Stedall, *John Pell*, 108.

Mordechai Feingold's work deserves special mention, as far as understanding the construction of collective identities of learned communities in early modernity is concerned. In influential studies of university teaching practices in the early modern period, the foundation of scientific academies, and the irradiating power of informal intellectual circles, Feingold pictured the genesis of a European scientific community in terms of hubs and networks at the crossroads of interpersonal "confabulations" and institutionalization, and considered the peculiar emergence of universalistic aspirations in confessional settings.[10] Along similar lines, other studies analyzed the tensions between the simultaneous emergence of modern identities (national, religious, etc.) and cosmopolitan attitudes among European intellectuals.[11] To appreciate the complexity of such phenomena, Yehuda Elkana introduced the heuristic concept of "global contextualism."[12] In his recent book *Überreichweiten: Perspektiven einer globalen Ideengeschichte*, Martin Mulsow bridged the gap between micro-history

[10] To mention just a few, see Mordechai Feingold, *The Mathematicians' Apprenticeship: Science, Universities and Society in England 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Mordechai Feingold, ed., *Jesuit Science and the Republic of Letters* (Cambridge, MA, and London: The MIT Press, 2003); and Mordechai Feingold, "Confabulatory Life," in *Duncan Liddel (1561–1613): Networks of Polymathy and the Northern European Renaissance*, ed. Pietro Daniel Omodeo and Karin Friedrich (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 22-34.

[11] For a case study on the combination of national identities, confessional belonging, and secular science in cosmopolitan contexts, see Pietro Daniel Omodeo, "Cesare Cremonini's Non-Theological Cosmology: A Contribution to Padua's Secular Culture in Times of Wars of Religion," *British Journal for the History of Science* (2023): 1-19, doi:10.1017/S0007087423000134.

[12] Yehuda Elkana, "The University of the 21st Century: An Aspect of Globalization," in *The Globalization of Knowledge in History*, ed. Jürgenn Renn (Berlin: Edition Open Access, 2012), 605-30 (610-2); see also Jürgenn Renn, "Survey: Knowledge as a Fellow Traveller," in *The Globalization of Knowledge in History*, ed. Jürgenn Renn, 205-43 (205).

and global history with an array of studies on the interplay of multiple historical and geographical perspectives. As he argues, early modern intellectual culture resulted from the composition of variable standpoints, through intense exchanges of letters, manufacts, ideas and curiosa across the globe.[13]

Still, although studies of networks and circulation of knowledge are fundamental in contemporary scholarship, special focus on these should not come to the detriment of other important dimensions of the history of ideas, such as material, practical, technological and ecological aspects. If the circulation model was assumed as the all-encompassing paradigm for intellectual history and cultural studies, it would indeed mirror a sort of "free market" ideology, as it were, according to which wealth can be reduced to, and entirely understood as, the product of the circulation of money and commodities. For a more complete historical picture, one must also look at the "workshops" where such commodities – both abstract and material, such as ideas, hypotheses, theories, experiments, notes, letters, and manuscripts – are produced. Such a need for integration also explains the development, parallel to network studies, of investigations of practical knowledge, in its implicit and embodied forms. Pamela O. Long, Pamela H. Smith, and Ursula Klein are among the most prominent scholars who closely scrutinized the manufacturing of knowledge in the modern era.[14] Their research

[13] Martin Mulsow, *Überreichweiten: Perspektiven einer globalen Ideengeschichte* (Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2022). See also Martin Mulsow, "A Reference Theory of Globalized Ideas," *Global Intellectual History* 2 (2017): 67-87.

[14] Pamela O. Long, *Artisan/Practitioners and the Rise of the New Science, 1400-1600* (Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 2011); Pamela H. Smith, *The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2004); Ursula Klein, *Nützliches Wissen: Die Erfindung der Technikwissenschaften* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2016). See also Matteo Valleriani, ed., *The Structures of Practical Knowledge* (Cham: Springer, 2017).

advanced and rearticulated the legacy of earlier "externalist" scholarship in the history of science, initiated by Boris Hessen, Edgar Zilsel and Robert K. Merton in the 1930s and 1940s.[15]

Now, while a historicizing sociology of science has flourished in different forms, a full-fledged inquiry into the "sociological roots" (to use Zilsel's famous expression)[16] of early-modern philosophy has not yet been developed. Regarding Hobbes, the work that marked the shift from a historiography of science divided between "internalist" and "externalist" approaches to one looking at micro-historical specificities, thinkers' intentions and strategies, and relevant cultural frameworks is Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer's *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*. Hobbes's "political epistemology," as they called his incorporation of natural, gnoseological and political concerns, showcases their thesis that "solutions to the problem of knowledge are solutions to the problem of social order."[17] Independent of the various ways in which their book was received and the inevitable criticisms to which it has been exposed,[18] Shapin and

---

[15] See, among others, Gideon Freudenthal and Peter McLaughlin, eds., *The Social and Economic Roots of the Scientific Revolution: Texts by Boris Hessen and Henryk Grossmann* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009), and Gerardo Ienna, "The International and Interdisciplinary Circulation of Boris Hessen's Theses," in Boris Hessen, *Manuscripts and Documents on the History of Physics: A Historical Materialist Textbook*, ed. Pietro Daniel Omodeo and Sean Winkler (Venezia: Verum Factum, 2022), 75-129.

[16] Edgar Zilsel, "The Sociological Roots of Science," The American Journal of Sociology 47 (1942): 544-62; repr. in *Social Studies of Science* 30 (2000): 935-49.

[17] Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle and Experimental Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 99 and 332.

[18] Noel Malcolm rejects Shapin and Schaffer's thesis that Hobbes turned to plenism in his *De corpore* for political reasons (Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, 190-1). See also Cees Leijenhorst, *The Mechanisation of Aristotelianism: The Late Aristotelian Setting of Thomas Hobbes' Natural*

Schaffer's work prompted a new approach to the history of science that focuses on local settings, political and intellectual, and which can be also fruitfully applied to philosophical topics. So, for instance, it has been argued that Hobbes's direct involvement, during the 1620s, in the affairs of the Virginia and Bermuda Companies, through his pupil, friend, and then patron William Cavendish, 2nd Earl of Devonshire (c. 1590-1628),[19] can make sense of much of his later political philosophy.[20] And, with specific reference to Newcastle's later patronage of Hobbes, Lisa T. Sarahson demonstrated the practical effects of this relationship on both Hobbes and his patron: how it helped fashion their respective statuses and careers, providing them with intellectual freedom and social recognition.[21]

Philosophy (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 127. For a survey of critical reviews of Shapin and Schaffer's *Leviathan and the Air-Pump*, see Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, "Introduction to the 2011 Edition: Up for Air: *Leviathan and the Air-Pump* a Generation On," in Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle and the Experimental Life*, 2nd edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), xi-l (xxi-xxxvii).

[19] Not to be confused with William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Newcastle. For a useful breakdown of the many, often homonymous members of the two branches of the Cavendish family (the Newcastle and the Devonshire) who were important in Hobbes's life, see Martinich, *Hobbes: A Biography*, 24-5.

[20] On this, see the recent article by Sébastien Bauer, "Hobbes, Cavendish, and the Bermuda Company," *The Historical Journal* (2024): 1-20, doi:10.1017/S0018246X24000414, which contributes to a discussion initiated by Noel Malcolm's findings (see his "Hobbes, Sandys, and the Virginia Company," *The Historical Journal* 24 (1981): 297-321; repr. in Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, 53-79) and prosecuted by many influential Hobbes scholars. For a review of the scholarship debate, see Bauer, "Hobbes, Cavendish, and the Bermuda Company," 1-2.

[21] Lisa T. Sarasohn, "Thomas Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle: A Study in the Mutuality of Patronage before the Establishment of the Royal Society," *Isis* 90 (1999): 715-37.

In general, it should be clear that studying the origin and meaning of Hobbes's philosophical ideas goes hand in hand with studying the context and conversations within which they developed, and vice versa. Since 1630, Hobbes's scientific and philosophical production becomes more and more entangled with his relationship with the Earl of Newcastle and his brother Charles. By the second half of the 1640s – during the "years of exile" of Hobbes and the Cavendishes[22] – the progress of Hobbes's work is almost inseparable from the dynamics of the Cavendish Circle, through which his intellectual production was nurtured, received, circulated, and sometimes prompted. These dynamics, in turn, were affected by the presence within the circle of a heavyweight thinker such as Hobbes, whose input was influential. Hence the topic of this issue, and the methodological considerations above.

On the one hand, Secord's claim that the understanding of the history of scientific ideas cannot be achieved without studying the history of the circulation of knowledge – and that therefore we need to "think … about the problem of the movement of local knowledge"[23] – applies perfectly to an investigation into the relevance of the Cavendish Circle for the history of philosophical ideas in seventeenth-century Europe, and for the development of Hobbes's ideas in particular. While nowadays we tend to distinguish between the history of philosophy and the history of science as different fields of inquiry, for Hobbes and other thinkers of his time philosophical and scientific speculations belonged to the same research agenda, and were inseparable from one another.[24] And the Cavendish Circle had an irreplaceable historical role in helping the circulation and advancement of philosophical and scientific knowledge across European countries – especially after the battle of

[22] Jacquot, "Sir Charles Cavendish and His Learned Friends. II. The Years of Exile," 175.

[23] Secord, "Knowledge in Transit," 660.

[24] Margaret Cavendish's philosophical masterpiece, the *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy*, bears in the title the connection between her philosophy and the new scientific practices that were promoted by scientists and *novatores* across Europe, including of course members of the recently founded Royal Society.

Marston Moor (1644), when William and Charles Cavendish moved from England to continental Europe, to reside in Hamburg, Paris, Rotterdam and Antwerp. They kept acting as influential patrons of intellectuals and artists, corresponded with learned thinkers and had books and manuscripts transmitted over long distances. With their actions they established a truly cosmopolitan, international network which disseminated knowledge and united prominent cultural figures throughout Europe.

On the other hand, as long as William and Charles Cavendish acted, through their curiosity, their requests and their queries, as communicators and instigators of new ideas and research in philosophy and the sciences, their intellectual network turned out to be not only the crossing point of shared knowledge originating from diverse sources: it was the "workshop," as it were, where new concepts and theories were forged (sometimes under direct request) and communally examined for collective validation. As contributions to this collection will show, in some cases the way in which philosophical and scientific ideas are discussed and circulated by and through the Cavendish Circle is *ipso facto* the way in which these ideas come into being in the first place.

3. Synopsis

The special issue is comprised of three research articles, one research note, and a book review.

In the first article, "The *Leviathan* Table of Sciences and Newcastle's Queries," Timothy Raylor analyzes the idiosyncratic presence of the folding "table of sciences" in Chapter 9 of Hobbes's *Leviathan*. Raylor argues that the table is probably a document originally prepared by Hobbes in response to a query raised by William Cavendish, Marquess of Newcastle, between 1644 and 1645. On the one hand, Hobbes's table of science would present what was a transitional phase in his thinking of the sciences and their categorization; on the other hand, it serves to show how Hobbes's written philosophical production could be conditioned by his patron's requests. The article includes a transcription of a document by Newcastle (preserved at the Library of the University of Nottingham, Portland Pw 1/666), which contains what is likely the Marquess' written reply to Hobbes's table of sciences.

William and Charles Cavendish's practice of promoting scientific and philosophical activity, also through written documents shared with members of their intellectual entourage, is further explored in the second article, "*Modus notandi*: Sir Charles Cavendish's notes on Thomas Hobbes and Walter Warner." In it, Stephen Clucas examines the social life of the manuscript notes that were written, collected and transmitted by Sir Charles Cavendish and other correspondents of the Cavendish Circle. By analyzing examples from Sir Charles Cavendish and John Pell's correspondence, Clucas demonstrates how extensive and far-reaching the shared use of notes was. Clucas then focuses on a precise set of notes by Cavendish, some of which refer to a lost treatise by Walter Warner (1557-1643) on the circulation of the blood, while others to a draft of Hobbes's *De corpore*. These documents reveal how Sir Charles Cavendish utilized notes to gather material from different sources working on similar topics, to then feed debates on works in progress by members of the circle.

The third article, "Acknowledging Sexual Equality: Hobbes's and Cavendish's Amazons" by Mary Jo MacDonald, focuses on the impact that Hobbes's philosophizing had on the member of the circle who was the closest to William Cavendish: namely, his wife Margaret. MacDonald argues that Margaret Cavendish's portrayal of the Amazon's army in her *Bell in Campo* (1662) is intended to criticize and rectify Hobbes's own description of the Amazons in his political writings. In his natural reconstruction of the myth of the Amazons, Hobbes presents them as non-threating subjects by omitting their violent origins. Cavendish's own depiction of the Amazons, by contrast, is more faithful to the original myth: they are valiant and victorious fighters, who rebel against men's rules and who achieve equality via their martial capacities and by being in the position to threaten their male counterparts with subjugation.

Margaret Cavendish's reception of Hobbes's philosophy is also the focus of Marcus Adams's research note, "Margaret Cavendish as Critic and Reviser of Hobbes on Matter and Motion." Adams argues that Margaret Cavendish shares Hobbes's view that it is impossible to abstract accidents from bodies. Cavendish's rejections of Hobbes's distinction between "place" and "magnitude," and her

consequent refusal of Hobbes's account of motion as locomotion – the relinquishing by a body of one place for another – would depend on this shared assumption, since for Cavendish one cannot distinguish body, place and magnitude. Cavendish's own account of matter as self-moving, and her conception of motion as mereological change, would then qualify as revisions of Hobbes's own accounts based on common grounds.

A book review by Sylvie Kleiman-Lafon concludes the issue. The book examined is an edition and translation into French, by Jauffrey Berthier and Nicolas Dubos, of two texts included in the anonymous manuscript *Horæ Subsecivæ. Observations and Discourses* (1620), attributed to Hobbes and William Cavendish, 2nd Earl of Devonshire.[25] As pointed out by Kleiman-Lafon, one of the main aims of the editors of the book is to demonstrate that the *Horæ Subsecivæ* were written by Hobbes and Cavendish under the direct supervision of Francis Bacon, and that they were meant to promote Bacon's theses. This juvenile work, Berthier and Dubois argue, is one that shapes the development of Hobbes's political philosophy.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all participants in the workshop "The Cavendish Circle: Philosophical Networks in the 17th Century," which took place on 30 April 2024, at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, and in particular the invited speakers: Julia Borcherding, Stephen Clucas, Antonia LoLordo, Karolina Hübner, and Timothy Raylor. We would also like to thank the editors of *Hobbes Studies*, for their careful assistance in putting the issue together.

The workshop and this publication are part of the of the MSCA PF project 101064483 MC-EuCon "Margaret Cavendish (1623-1673) in the history of European ideas of consciousness." Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only

[25] Thomas Hobbes and William Cavendish, *Discours sur l'histoire*, ed. and tr. Jauffrey Berthier and Nicolas Dubos (Paris: Gallimard, 2024).

and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.