



Hobbes's Biblical Beasts: Leviathan and Behemoth

Author(s): Patricia Springborg

Source: *Political Theory*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (May, 1995), pp. 353-375

Published by: [Sage Publications, Inc.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191883>

Accessed: 19/02/2014 11:36

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Political Theory*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

HOBBS'S BIBLICAL BEASTS

Leviathan and Behemoth

PATRICIA SPRINGBORG

University of Sydney

Beyond the actual works of nature a poet may now go; but beyond the conceived possibility of nature, never. I can allow a Geographer to make in the Sea, a Fish or a Ship, which by the scale of his map would be two or three hundred mile long, and think it done for ornament, because it is done without the precincts of his undertaking; but when he paints an *Elephant* so, I presently apprehend it as ignorance and a plain confession of *Terra incognita*.

*Hobbes's Answer to Sir William Davenant's
Dedicatory Preface to Gondibert, 1651, 81.*

(1) HOBBS'S BEAST, THE BIBLICAL LEVIATHAN

In Hobbes's little discussed published response to Davenant's preface to *Gondibert*, dedicated to him, Hobbes reproves Davenant, the rigorous acolyte who claims to have learned his epistemology from Hobbes. Ghosts and spooks are one thing, Hobbes suggests, but to abandon the entire Western fabulous tradition of rhetoric and poesy was to abandon what distinguished civilization from the rude culture of the Americas. Civilization is the work of the imagination, "fancy," and the only restrictions on its exercise were those of appropriateness. There is, as we shall show, symptomatic irony in Hobbes's choice of the metaphor of the elephant. In the seventeenth century, Leviathan was taken for a great ship, a crocodile, or a whale, and Behemoth for an elephant. The *Oxford English Dictionary* credits Hobbes with lexical innovation, as the first to use the term Leviathan—the biblical serpent or sea monster, a huge ship or person of immense power and the "great Satan" of Isaiah 27:1—as the synonym for a commonwealth.¹ Hobbes's Leviathan is

indeed a work of the imagination, a creature of artifice rather than nature, a *mortal* God, and scripture vouches for it.

Commentators have focused considerable attention on the iconography of the engraved frontispiece to *Leviathan*, believed to have been produced by the printer Andrew Crooke, under Hobbes's supervision, and perhaps the work of Hobbes's acquaintance and Charles's former tutor in drawing, the engraver Wenceslaus Holler.² The frontispiece depicts an image of Leviathan, a kinglike figure wielding sword and crozier, his gigantic body composed of the small bodies of the people of his realm. Overhead flies the banner headline from the Book of Job 41:33-4, "There is no power over earth than compares to him," the conclusion of which is reserved for the text: "a creature without fear . . . king over all the sons of pride." Much less attention has been focused on the significance of the biblical names *Leviathan* and *Behemoth*, in what would, in the seventeenth century, have been a most startling usage. Hobbes, in choosing *Leviathan* and *Behemoth* as his titles, drops enough hints to make it clear to his audience that he refers to none other than the beasts of the Apocrypha, familiar from the Hebrew Theogony and associated in chiliastic thought with the Second Coming. How does he mean the names then?³ And what is their significance for his religious doctrine?

In a recent article, Tracy Strong argues, correctly I believe, that "God-given geometry is [Hobbes's] model of and for power to which none on earth compare," because men cannot only read it but *see* it. He cites Job 38:1-7, the beginning of the passage that leads to Hobbes's headline epigraph:

Then the Lord answered Job out of the tempest: who is this whose ignorant words cloud my design in darkness? Brace yourself and stand up like a man; I will ask questions, and you shall answer. Where were you when I laid the earth's foundations? Tell me, if you know and understand. Who settled its dimensions? Surely you should know. Who stretched this measuring-line over it? On what do its supporting pillars rest? Who set its corner-stone in place, when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted aloud? (Job 38:1-7)⁴

The invention of geometry is credited to the ancient Egyptians as a rapid method to recalculate property boundaries washed away by the annual inundation of the Nile. It was appropriate that God should have used the language of geometry in the Hebrew theogony to establish his proprietorship in an antediluvian world—and trump the Egyptians. It was equally appropriate that Hobbes should have taken geometry as proof of his epistemology. If geometry, which laid the foundations of the world, belonged to the designs of God that could be *seen*, the Bible belonged to a dispensation of sacred texts that could be *read*, rendering superfluous the interventions of philosophers

and theologians. So even Job 41:9-11 can be given a more optimistic reading. The divine show of strength is a show and tell:⁵

Behold, the hope of him is in vain: shall not *one* be cast down even in the sight of him?
None *is so* fierce that dare stir him up: who then is able to stand before me? Who hath
prevented me, that I should repay *him*? *whatsoever* is under the whole heaven is mine.

Leviathan may be an image of the absolutist state, projected as a necessary, almost natural, work of creation. But as a work of creation it is not self-generating and, like Job, we must turn to its author for the source of its power. Absolute governments, the Leviathans of this world, from their archetypes in ancient Egypt and Babylon to their early modern types in the papacy, Spain, and France, were also constructed. Let us see how they were built, Hobbes says, and then ask the question whence their power derives. Leviathan and Behemoth, as perhaps God's answer to Job was intended to imply, are *mortal* Gods who have a role in the scheme of the *immortal* God. They have their own cycles of generation and decay and their maintenance is also a work of art.

Leviathan is the state, created by man in his image as man is created in the image of God, with divine sanction, indirectly as a continuation of the work of creation, or directly as an extension of the original *Fiat*, by which the world was made. Hobbes embroidered the metaphor, focusing on the "artificiality" of the state by creating a figure for the state as a species of *Automata*, with a spring, string, and wheels as heart, nerves, and joints, and *Sovereignty* as the "Artificiall Soul," "giving life and motion to the whole body."⁶ In the important first chapter of part 2 of *Leviathan*, chapter 17, "Of the Causes, Generation and Definition of a COMMON-WEALTH," Hobbes noted of the covenants by which the artificial unity of the state is created and its sovereign authorized: "the Multitude so united in one Person, is called a COMMON-WEALTH, in latine CIVITAS. 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."⁷ At this point, *Leviathan* is no longer the body politic but the sovereign who personifies it. Returning in chapter 28 to the image of the automaton and "the nature of Punishment, and Reward; which are, as it were, the Nerves and Tendons, that move the limbes and joynts of a Common-wealth,"⁸ Hobbes concluded:

Hitherto I have set forth the nature of Man . . . together with the great power of his Governour, whom I compared to *Leviathan*, taking that comparison out of the two last verses of the one and fortieth of *Job*; where God having set forth the great power of *Leviathan*, calleth him King of the Proud. *There is nothing*, saith he, *on earth to be*

compared with him. He is made so as not to be afraid. Hee seeth every high thing below him; and is King of all the children of pride. But because he is mortal, and subject to decay, as all other Earthly creatures are; and because there is that in heaven, (though not on earth) that he should stand in fear of, and whose Lawes he ought to obey; I shall in the next following Chapters speak of his Diseases, and the causes of his Mortality; and of what Lawes of Nature he is bound to obey.⁹

This is a startling innovation in the reading of the biblical Leviathan, especially in an age in which allegorical interpretations were eschewed in favour of a literal reading of the bible. How precisely did Hobbes expect his audience to receive his *Leviathan*? And how was it received?

A word of caution might be introduced here about the distinction between a literal and an allegorical reading of the Bible. In his survey of Protestant writing, Tracy Strong in "How to Write Scripture," rightly points out the epistemic significance of the Reformers' claim to "know" the Bible and not merely to "interpret" it.¹⁰ Interpretation as an epistemic rule is post-Kantian, or more accurately, post-Buber. It rests most generally on the claim that we can never know how far our perceptual categories and limitations skew our ideas. Following a line of thought initiated by Hobbes to explain how we can posit the existence of God, as Strong rightly points out, thinkers from Locke to the present claimed that we may *infer* the existence of something if we can name it.¹¹ However, the faith—for that is what it was—that we can *know* the Bible lay undisturbed by these considerations, which represented precisely a philosophic extension of the Protestant epistemic posture, until the great hermeneutic watershed introduced by Martin Buber, Paul Tillich, and Reinhold Niebuhr, members of the German critical school of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. (It is an open secret that current hermeneutical and phenomenological schools owe their insights once again to a seachange in biblical criticism, once again from the German school.)

A final word of caution: to claim that Reformation commentators believed that one could "know" the Bible is not to suggest that they lacked sophistication about what they were doing—which was essentially a work of "re-interpretation." Reformation exegetes, including Hobbes, knew exactly what they were doing because for the most part they were activists and their methodology was institutionally driven. Up to and including Locke, their epistemology was designed to cut the Church in general, and the clergy in particular, out of the loop between the authorized version and the authorizing civil authority.¹² For this reason, particularly problematic exegesis of obscure and ancient texts, like the Book of Job, was eschewed; texts where, ironically, Hobbes, whose purposes were not so different, found his best proving ground for the new Leviathan.

(2) REFORMATION COMMENTARY
ON LEVIATHAN AND BEHEMOTH

If Hobbes had spun his construction of the mechanical Leviathan out of the Book of Job, among the most cited and most glossed books of the Old Testament in the Reformation, it was surely not done innocently. He must certainly have been aware that the purpose of Reformation retranslation and reinterpretation was to reject allegorical in favour of a literal reading of scripture. The Book of Job was favoured precisely because it addressed the theodicy problem: how a beneficent God may be reconciled with the power of evil. It provided, at the same time, a text enjoining patience on those afflicted or persecuted. But commentators cautioned against making too much of the more difficult parts of the book, allegorical as they clearly are.

Job Expovnded by Theodore Beza, partly in manner of a Commentary, partly in manner of a paraphrase (1589?) is addressed to Queen Elizabeth on behalf of the French Protestants who sought her protection. It is therefore one of the most political readings. It very bluntly states Behemoth to be an elephant and Leviathan to be a crocodile. Beza, conceding the peculiar difficulties of the Book of Job, makes the case for a literal reading by referring to appropriate standards of biblical criticism: "But this booke, then the which there is none in all the Bible, if I be not deceiued, no not Moses himselfe, of greater antiquitie, is in manie places made verie obscure to vs and hard to be vnderstood, partly by reason of the profoundnes of the thinges themselues here debated among most wise men, and not to be conceaued of euery one, partly by diuers straunge words & also phrases differing from the pure *Hebrue*."¹³ He cautions against presuming "to be ouer wise . . . wise about that which is meete," expressing the view that: "the wise men of other nations, whome the *Greekes* call Philosophers, haue, touching the true vse, merveilouslie prophaned it." Striking a dark note, he observes: "moreouer . . . the abuse of this Science hath bred that detestable Art *Magick*, which is the welspring of al mischeife, as also that false diuining *Astrologie*, which hauing broken the bounds of true Natural knowledge, entreth into the very secrets of God, and at this day hath bewitched the whole world."¹⁴

Beza, one of the most sophisticated and well read of the Reformation biblical commentators, is as committed to the abandonment of the allegorical interpretation of scripture as the most fundamentalist preacher. And for just the reasons that Hobbes would otherwise endorse: because allegorical constructs were abstractions, they created a host of monsters and phantasms inhabiting the dark regions of superstition and magic, the terrain of the papacy, the Spanish, heretics, and relics of gentilism.

Herbert of Cherbury, in a pioneering English study of "Gentilism," had included the enigmatic statement: "As far as I can find, the great *Leviathan* was known to the Jews only, tho' I question whether the *Rabbins* have left us any Description of it. There are several Reasons may be given, why Fish should exceed all other Animals in Magnitude."¹⁵ Quite plainly in this work, written by an antiquarian and diplomat whom Hobbes knew and admired, *Leviathan* was a monster and nothing more.

Others agreed with him. Nathaniel Culverwell, in his *Elegant and Learned Discourse of the Light of Nature* of 1646, addressing the question whether the Laws of Nature are binding on beasts, had asked "What are those Lawes that are observed by a rending and tearing Lion, by a devouring *Leviathan*?"¹⁶—like Herbert, plainly taking *Leviathan* for a beast, and no extraordinary one in this case. Reformation commentaries on the books of Job and Isaiah are uniformly condemnatory of allegorical interpretations, in particular of these passages of scripture, insisting that *Leviathan* and *Behemoth* are simply beasts, although often differing on what beasts they might be. Beza stated flatly "I omit that custome which hath continued euer since *Origenes* time, I say not of inuerting the natural sence of the sacred text to the framing of certaine straunge allegories, but euen of marring and peruerting it."¹⁷

The beasts of the Book of Job were regularly interpreted as demonstrations of divine omnipotence and nothing more.¹⁸ So George Abbott simply exhorts, "Consider the Elephant [*Behemoth*]. . . . consider well the Whale [*Leviathan*]."¹⁹ John Oecolampadius (Halschein), to whom Beza refers, heads up his comments on Job 40:10, "*Voici l'elephant*."²⁰ He hopes to lay alternative possibilities to rest with a review of the Hebraists as well as the Reformers on the subject of Job's beasts, finding no exception to their treatment as animals, even by such diverse figures as the Hebraists Rabbi Aben Ezra, Rabbi Levi, Rabbi Moshe, Moshe the Egyptian, Zwingli, Luther, and Thomas Aquinas.²¹ Oecolampadius makes certain observations on the use of the Hebrew plural, *Behemoth*, for the elephant, singular, noting the derivation of *Leviathan* from the Hebrew verb "Lauah," signifying "addition." He is one of the few to comment on *Behemoth*'s "tail stiff like a Cedar,"²² attributing the metaphor, rather unconvincingly, to a "hyperbolic mode of speaking."²³

John Calvin, in his *Sermons of Maister Iohn Calvin, vpon the Booke of Iob*,²⁴ addressing the question of *Behemoth*, noted also that "the worde *Behema* signifieth simply a Beast, and vnder that name are Oxen and all other beastes comprehended"; *Behemoth* is simply the plural of *Behema*. "Neuertheles it cannot be coniectured what kinde of beast it is that hee speaketh of, except it bee an Elephant, by reason of the hugenesse of that beastes body." The

hugeness serves a purpose: "if we were wise ynough, we needed not to goe out of our selues to behold the maiestie of God: howbeit men must be sent to the beasts bicause of their vnthankfulnesse, in that they know not God as he sheweth hymselfe vnto them"; for this reason the unregenerate "haue need of suche mirrours as are set before vs here in respect of the Elephants & other like beasts."²⁵ Calvin, like other Reformation commentators reads Leviathan and Behemoth as simple demonstrations of unfathomable divine power: "it is purposely said, that *these Elephants were created with us . . .* so as men must be rauished besides themselues when they thinke thereon."²⁶ He adds, Leviathan is simply another "like beast," in this case a whale. It is a reading of the Book of Job on which Hobbes's extrapolation to the secular sovereign Leviathan depends, as we have argued here.

Calvin quickly forestalls any other possible interpretation, with a lengthy discursus on the necessity of a literal interpretation.²⁷

There is one peremptorie reason to shewe vs that we must take this text simply as it standeth, & not shiftingly. For we have seen heretofore how it was Gods intent to teach men after a grosse and homely maner, according to their owne small capacitie, and that his doing thereof is to the end that his mightie power should be the better proued vnto them.²⁸

About Leviathan he is even more emphatic: "As touching the worde *Leuiathan*, through the whole scripture it signifieth a Whale." But he makes some concession to allegorical interpretation, in allowing men to infer the power of the devil from the strength of these beasts.²⁹

Calvin certainly concedes that allegorical interpretations abound,³⁰ but so strongly was the new Protestant biblical criticism committed to disposing of them, as relics of Catholicism and the power of the Church to interpret scripture, that he enjoins his congregation to reflect on the whale, "is it not an incredible thyng to see so huge a creature, liuing in the water? Who were able to fashion the moule of so great, huge, and strong a beast."³¹

In fact, in his *Commentary vpon the Prophecie of Isaiah*, dedicated to Henry, Prince of England, son of James I, and Princess Elizabeth, his wife, and perhaps intended for a different audience, Calvin does give an allegorical interpretation, making of Leviathan not only a figure for the Devil but also for the King of Egypt. Commenting on Isaiah 27:1 ("In that day the Lord will visit Leuiathan that pearcing Serpent, and Leuiathan that crooked Serpent, with his sore and great and mightie sword: and will kill the Dragon that is in the sea"), he remarks: "For mine owne part I make no question but by way of Allegorie he speakes here of Satan and his whole kingdome, describing it

under the figure of some monstrous beast." The signification of Leviathan as a figure for tyrants, Egypt, and Satan is quite explicit.³²

The Prophet speakes heere of Gods iudgement in generall, and so comprehends the whole kingdom of Satan. For hauing spoken before of the vengeance of God against tyrants and vnbeleeuers which had shed innocent blood, he now passeth on further, and publisheth the edict it selfe. The word *Leuiathan* is diuerslie expounded, but generallie it signifies a serpent, or the whales and fishes of the sea, which are as monsters in regard of their excellieue greatnes. Now howsoever this description agrees to the king of Egypt, yet vnder this one he meant to comprehend all the enemies of the Church.

Martin Luther understood full well the allegorical force of Leviathan and Behemoth. In his *Magnificat*,³³ he shows how the Bible demonizes "the proud, those "forlorn people" of the Book of Job: "Sometimes it calls them adders who stop their ears lest they hear;³⁴ sometimes stubborn unicorns;³⁵ sometimes roaring lions;³⁶ sometimes great immovable rocks;³⁷ sometimes dragons;³⁸ and much else besides." Leviathan and Behemoth are demonizations too: "Equally well are they depicted in Job 40 and 41, where the same kind of people are called Behemoth [Job 40:10ff, 41:10ff]. Behema means a single animal, but behemoth means a number of such animals, in other words, a race which has an animal mind, and does not allow the spirit of God in it."³⁹ In the sixteenth century, Luther had already given a racial reading of the terms: "The Bible describes them [Behemoth] as having an eye like the red of dawn, for there is no measure to their cunning, and their skin is so tough that they only scoff at a stab or a sting." Referring now to Leviathan, he continued: "the monsters" scales overlap, and leave no intervening space; for these people hold closely together, and the spirit of God cannot enter them."⁴⁰ (A famous sexual harrasment case at the University of Pennsylvania in 1993 turned on whether the Hebrew word for "water-buffalo" constituted a racial slur; the word in question was "behema.")

It seems then that Reformation commentators were well aware of the allegorical referents for Leviathan and Behemoth in the powerful states of ancient Egypt and Assyria. But perhaps because these allusions implied an immanent critique of secular nation states—already alarmingly fragile, and the readier to persecute, the more fragile they were—or because the Reformers discouraged apocalyptic speculation—and these were apocryphal texts—they found it politic to play them down. This Hobbes was not willing to do, finding fertile material in the Book of Job for his mortal commonwealth, personified by the sword-wielding sovereign, a work of artifice both fearsome and fragile, mandated by God to reign in historical time, that sliver of temporality created in the interstices of eternity.

(3) BRAMHALL CATCHING LEVIATHAN

It was quite a sheer perversity on Hobbes's part to make such play of the beasts of the Book of Job, and, true to form, he seemed to intend it as a provocation. When, in a series of exchanges with Bishop John Bramhall, Hobbes challenged Bramhall to put in print his objections to his religious doctrine, he offered him the title "*Behemoth against Leviathan*."⁴¹ Bramhall, whose systematic rebuttal of the theological chapters of *Leviathan* has never been surpassed, and who referred to that work as "*Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum*," countered with, "*The catching of LEVIATHAN, or the Great Whale*."⁴² The irony was not lost on Bramhall that Hobbes, who argued so systematically against phantasms, should have resorted to a mythical monster to characterize his commonwealth.⁴³ Bramhall was not the only critic to remark on this peculiarity, the subject of Alexander Ross's, *Leviathan Drawn out with a Hook* (1653), but he was certainly the most thorough. He dared Hobbes to show that he himself was not Leviathan—a possibility on which subsequent commentators, pointing to the resemblance that Leviathan's head in one of the versions of the frontispiece bears to the author, have speculated.⁴⁴ Bramhall taunts Hobbes, whose Leviathan, he says, is a man-fish, like the Palestinian idol Dagon,⁴⁵ rather than a whale-fish, the biblical original:

his Leviathan, or mortal God, is a meer phantasme of his own devising, neither flesh nor fish, but a confusion of a man and a whale, engendered in his own brain: not unlike Dagon the Idol of the Philistims, a mixture of a god and a man and a fish. The true littoral Liviathan is the Whale-fish.

Bramhall challenges Hobbes the rhetor, who tried to summon into existence a polity by persuasion, invoking classical heroes, Hercules, Pericles, and the proverbial Pythagoras. No one saw more clearly than Bramhall the brazenness of Hobbes's heresy. He who in work after work had damned the opinionated philosophers of the Greek schools for contaminating early Christianity with their teachings, dared himself to offer an opinion on the Christian commonwealth that convicted him as an heresiarch—"a second Pythagoras, at least." Hobbes himself was the monster, among all the children of pride, the great Leviathan incarnate:

And for a metaphorical Leviathan, I know none so proper to personate that huge body as *T. H.* himself. The Leviathan doth not take his pastime in the deep with so much freedom, nor behave himself with so much height and insolence, as *T. H.* doth in the Schooles, nor domineer over the lesser fishes with so much scorn and contempt, as he

doth over all other authours, censuring, branding, contemning, proscribing whatsoever is contrary to his humour; bustling and bearing down before him whatsoever cometh in his way, creating truth and falsehood by the breath of his mouth, by his sole authority, without other reason; A second Pythagoras at least. There have been self-conceited persons in all Ages, but none that could ever *King it* like him *over all the children of pride*. (Job 41.34.) Ruit, agit, rapit, tundit & prosternit.⁴⁶

Bramhall has Hobbes's measure and knows that he can convict him of inconsistency:

I have provided three good harping irons for my self to dart at this monster, and am resolved to try my skill and fortune, whether I can be as successful against this phantastick Leviathan, as they are against the true Leviathan.⁴⁷

Bramhall's discursus on the whale-fish Leviathan is shaped to the structure of theological rebuttal, each line of argument a harpoon with which to spear Hobbes, more vulnerable than he thinks to the small fry who assail him. The passage may also be read as an elaborate allegory of the threat posed to the unitary state by nonconformists, namely the Protestant sects. Hobbes's heterodoxy opens the door, ironically, to the very proliferation of opinion he is most concerned to forestall. Bramhall paints frightful images of the consequences in the little mouse that "stealeth up thorough the Elephants trunk to eat his brains, making him die desperately mad"; the Indian rat that "creepeth into the belly of the gaping Crocodile, and knaweth his bowels asunder"; and the sword-fish and the thrasher-fish that join forces with the Greenland fishermen to overwhelm Leviathan, "at last to draw this formidable creature to the shore, or to their ship, and slice him in pieces and boile him in a Cauldron, and tun him up in oil."⁴⁸ The metonymy of Leviathan was the synecdoche of the state.

Hobbes had offered to his critics the intolerable provocation of an allegorical interpretation of scripture, against which they so heavily inveighed—even as he denied the spiritual and ghostly beings to which they, inconsistent by turn, subscribed in notions of the soul, angels and demons.⁴⁹ Leviathan's point was the spectre of countervailing power. The ghostly powers of the pope, as King of Fayrieland, were real enough; just as real had been the demonized power of pharaonic Egypt and Assyria to the fledgling Israelite state. Is the commonwealth then a Leviathan by inversion to render the papacy anti-Leviathan? Perhaps Hobbes saw himself as Leviathan with respect to the Church, fish-man and demon in the service of the state, and revelled in it, just so long as it did not cost him his head. In the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, his enchiridion in elegaic prose, he nicely turns the metaphor of Leviathan. The ancient imperial states, those mighty beasts, Egypt,

Assyria, and Rome, have all been hooked; and snares are being prepared for the rest. The *Historia Ecclesiastica* includes a long discursus on the serpent and the ensnaring arts of the papacy, its hooks and lures of many colours:⁵⁰

But now the Pope his end compleatly gains,
 And leads the People, and their Prince, in Chains:
 Now vast *Leviathan* the Hook receives,
 And *Behemoth* his wounded Nostrils grieves:
 All gently own the Pope's Imperial Sway
 Where'r the *Roman* eagles wing their Way. . . .
 No crafty Angler will his Art despise,
 Though in his Nets a scanty Profit lies;
 And ever busy'd in his small Affairs,
 He mends his Nets, or strictly views his Wares,
 His Lines new models, or his Hooks surveys,
 And ev'ry Thing in decent Order lays;
 Gay gaudy Flies of ev'ry Sort are seen,
 The bright Carnation and the lovely Green. . . .
 There skimming cross the Streams, with sov'reign Skill,
 The pointed Hooks th'unwary Fishes kill.

The inversion of *Leviathan* was now complete: the Papacy usurps the role of ancient Israel, "draw[ing] out *Leviathan* with an hooke or his tongue with a corde," piercing the nostrils of *Behemoth*. Those pitiable (but Satanic) monsters personifying the ancient Egyptian and Assyrian states, respectively, have given way to the great whale, the Christian commonwealth, and now the Pope acts the role of God the Father. Hobbes's play on the beasts of Job goes far beyond allegory and enters the realm of blasphemy. Is it any wonder the man was accused of heresy?

(4) *LEVIATHAN AND THE GALLIC HERCULES*

But perhaps we are looking in the wrong place to establish the meaning of *Leviathan*. The kingly figure wearing the four-arched crown, wielding scepter and sword, naked, his body composed of the many persons of his realm, may not be "the coiled one" at all. Presiding almost benignly over a model town spread out before him, the spires of churches and the orderly streets a model of civility, *Leviathan*, if that is who this figure is, would seem a guardian of civilization and no monster.⁵¹ Arrayed under the insignia of power civil and ecclesiastical, respectively, are symmetrical cameos. A castle is juxtaposed to the ark as seat of power; the crown versus the mitre, potent symbols. Over against the canon stands the divine thunderbolt; and the

banners and battle standards of jostling civil powers are pitted against the three pronged, Trinitarian forks, and the two horned dilemmas of ecclesiastical controversy. The dénouement is in each case different: war, the outcome of civil strife; the court of excommunication, the outcome of doctrinal malfeasance. Who is the guardian of cities, villages, shires, and fields, shown in the frontispiece? Is it the Godly Prince, and if so, how could he be Leviathan?⁵²

The depiction of Leviathan in the frontispiece is counterintuitive. Neither a ship nor a whale, it is much more an image drawn from medieval organic theories of kingship than a biblical image. There is a more obscure tradition to which Hobbes may be appealing, one to which he makes allusion in the body of the text, and that is the Gallic Hercules, mentioned by Diodorus Siculus,⁵³ alluded to by Apuleius, and of whom the Syrian Rhetor Lucian tells such a strange story.⁵⁴ Named by the Celts "Heracles Ogmios," he was old, bald, naked except for lion's skin, wrinkled, and "burned as black as can be, like an old sea-dog." But he carries the equipment of Heracles, the club and the quiver, and "is Heracles from head to heel as far as that goes."⁵⁵ He differs from the classical Heracles in a surprising respect: "That old Heracles of theirs drags after him a great crowd of men who are all tethered by the ears" to his tongue.⁵⁶ Lucian reports a Celtic stranger, fluent in Greek, who offered to "read [him] the riddle of the picture":⁵⁷

We Celts do not agree with you Greeks in thinking that Hermes is Eloquence: we identify Heracles with it, because he is far more powerful than Hermes. . . . In general, we consider that the real Heracles was a wise man who achieved everything by eloquence and applied persuasion as his principal force. His arrows represent words, I suppose, keen, sure and swift, which make their wounds in souls.

Not by chance, Hobbes invokes the image of the Gallic Hercules to describe his "Artificiall Man, which we call a Common-wealth," tied by "Artificiall Chains, called *Civill Lawes*, which [citizens] themselves, by mutual covenants, have fastned at one end, to the lips of that Man, or Assembly, to whom they have given the Sovereigne Power; and at the other end to their own Ears."⁵⁸ With this allusion, Hobbes demonstrates not only his classical knowledge but also his acquaintance with traditions of monarchy learned at first hand in France. Henry II, for his carefully scripted triumphal entry into Paris in 1549, had chosen the Gallic Hercules as an effigy of the king. Clad only in an animal skin, his pediment was a ship, flanked by two naked men raising a cartouche with the legend: "trahimur, seqvimurque volentes."⁵⁹ Referring to the four accompanying statues that personified the

Estates, their ears chained to the lips of the king, it translated: "we are pulled and we follow freely."⁶⁰

The message that rhetor Lucian reports: "you know the kinship between ears and tongue,"⁶¹ is one that Henry II had learned well. Eloquence was the lesson that the Renaissance rhetoricians and authors of mirrors taught. Gaillaume Budé had first proposed the model of the Gallic Hercules to Francis I in his 1518 *Institution du Prince*.⁶² Jean Bodin, who in the *Methodus* observed that "before the time of Henry II . . . we never used the word 'Majesty' in addressing the king,"⁶³ in *De la République* declared, "there is nothing more natural, than for the subjects to conforme themselves unto the manners, unto the doings and sayings of their prince . . . having their eyes, their senses, and all their spirits, wholly bent to the imitation of him."⁶⁴ He then took the liberty of advising the prince on his proper comportment:

Wherefore a prince that is wise is, so oft as he should show himself unto the people (which he should most seldom do) should so prepare himselfe, as that he may unto all men seeme even in his face and countenance to carry with him a certaine state and majestie yet still mixt with modestie, but especially in his speech, which should always be maiesticall and sententious.

The Heracles who taught by eloquence forsaking the club, his arrows words, became a Renaissance image for *lex animata*, the king as animate law. While Petrarch spoke of "healing speech," and Francis I aspired to "doulce eloquence et royal bonte," the eloquence of which Bodin was mindful was the language with which Francis I had in fact dealt with the rebels of La Rochelle: "with the maiesite of his speech [he] terrified them" into obedience.⁶⁵

Nor was eloquence the only lesson the Gallic Hercules taught. The classical hero took over the characteristics of his rival Hermes, as the civilizer of peoples, who taught agriculture, protected cities. His Eastern provenance crept back in Geoffrey Troy's 1510 edition of the false Berosus [Babylonicus]; and in 1529 Champfleury made him "not only King of Gaul but also a great magician, astronomer, and even founder of Paris."⁶⁶ Henry II himself at his 1550 ceremonial entry into Rouen had been greeted by a pageant depicting the Christian king as the antique Hercules, slaying the hydra, accompanied by Orpheus and the nine muses.⁶⁷ The bestiary of the Book of Job relates etymologically to the hydra and other monsters of the East Mediterranean myth cycle, Leviathan among them.

Hercules' nakedness, as portrayed in the 1649 royal entry statue, at first a potent classical pagan symbol, was both an evocation of the medieval doctrine of the King's Two Bodies and a satire upon it. It evoked the man, as

distinct from the king, who in the classical "double funeral" was represented quite simply as an old man's body in a shroud.⁶⁸ In France, the *persona* of the king, decked out in royal regalia, represented the office of kingship under a special aspect: the king-in-parlement as opposed to one man rule. It was to this ideal of the *robed* king that the ceremonial statue of the naked king Henry II, drawing the four estates in tow, bound by their ears to the lips of the king, was a direct affront. It suggested a rupture of traditional patterns of consultancy, of listening and speaking, between king and people, and a turn to government based upon imperial edicts and fear associated with Hispano-Papalism, the courts of Charles V and Philip II.⁶⁹

What could the Gallic Hercules have meant to Hobbes, whose only mentions of the classical hero by name are disparaging? In book 1 chapter 12 of *Leviathan* on Religion, Hobbes refers to Hercules with Bacchus as "mongrill Gods," added by the "Legislators of the Gentiles" for the benefit of the ignorant to the panoply of "ministeriall Gods," anthropomorphized and "endowed . . . with lands, and houses, and officers, and reveunues, set apart from all other humane uses; that is, consecrated, and made holy to those their Idols."⁷⁰ Hercules appears again in book 2 chapter 30, devoted to the "Office of the Sovereign Representative," in a discussion of the psychology of rewards and punishments as levers of power that might well have been written by the great commentator on the Roman Empire, Polybius. Preferment and benefices are signs not "of Gratitude, but of Fear: [nor] does it tend to the Benefit, but to the Dammage of the Publique":⁷¹

It is a contention with Ambition, like that of *Hercules* with the Monster *Hydra*, which having many heads for every one that was vanquished, there grew up three. For in like manner, when the stubbornesse of one Popular man, is overcome with Reward, there arise many more (by the Example) that do the same Mischief, in hope of like Benefit: and as all sorts of Manufacture, so also Malice encreaseth by being vendible.

Although apparently observations in passing, Hobbes's references are reliable clues to the Gallic Hercules as celebrated in sixteenth century France. His career did not end with Henry II, who aspired both to unfettered one-man rule of Polybian *monarchia*⁷² and the territorial ambitions of civilizing Hercules, who turned swords into plough shares and spears into pruning forks.⁷³ Henry IV, the former Protestant Henry of Navarre, who, judging Paris worth a Mass, converted to Catholicism, fathered the Catholic Henrietta Maria, Queen consort of Charles I, and later, with Sully, authored the Edict of Nantes, could be said to demonstrate the sort of religiosity of which Hobbes approved.⁷⁴ Succeeding Henry III (1551-89), whose reign oversaw bitter civil war between Protestants and Catholics, the latter united in a holy

league under the Duc de Guise, Henry IV, in the failing days of the Emperor Rudolf II, harboured ambitions to become King of the Romans and take up the cudgels of Christianity against the Turks, whose success in the Balkans at the battle of Kanizsa had shamed the Hapsburgs.⁷⁵ Henry's marriage to Maria de' Medici brought with it vistas of a Christendom, from the dominions of Austria to Italy and Spain, united against Islam, seen to herald a *renovatio* of Christian empire in which the Gallic Hercules was radically redeployed. Henry IV, who in 1594 had entered Paris as Perseus, who slew the dragon Spain, the Medusa, as it threatened to devour a chained virgin, was portrayed variously as Caesar, Alexander, Augustus, Constantine, and Charlemagne.⁷⁶ But his most symptomatic personifications were as the Gallic Hercules, just because of the symbolic complexity that the legendary progenitor of so many princely lines permitted.⁷⁷

In 1592 at the height of the civil war, Henry as Hercules, armed with a club, was portrayed "dragging the [three-headed] dog Cerberus up from the under-world with a rope, signify[ing] that by his resplendent virtue the Prince subdues and expels vices from his nation with just and hallowed laws," the Venetian Antonio Ricciardo Brixiano, reported.⁷⁸ His armaments were striking. On medal after medal, Henry IV is portrayed as Hercules-Hermes, bearer of peace, his weapons a caduceus and a club. The caduceus, Hermes' wand surmounted by entwined serpents, conflates images of the serpent staff of Moses and the ecclesiastical scepter, of which it was perhaps the prototype. Of these the equipment of Hobbes's Leviathan is noticeably similar.

By no accident, Henry IV as Gallic Hercules aspired to unite the two heads of the eagle, ecclesiastical and civil, long a dream of the Gallican Church, in which the king was saluted as founder of the Church of France, protector of cities, and "Empereur dans son Royaume."⁷⁹ The imperial *renovatio* was to combine the classical civilizing mission of Heracles-Hermes with a Christian peace in which the French king ruled as priest and prince. Vanquisher of the Medusa and the infidel abroad, he conquered "par la ceducée de sa clemence et vertu" at home,⁸⁰ an image exquisitely crafted by engravers of medals, architects, and designers of royal entries, humanist historians, philologists, and poets. Isaac Casaubon, who dedicated his commentaries on Polybius to Henry IV, hailed him as "mighty author of peace, haven for those who are in danger and sole anchor of a Europe long storm-tossed and blown off her course."⁸¹ Honoré d'Urfé's famous allegorical-pastoral novel *L'Astrée*, which tells of the Herculean travails of a young prince, finally admitted into the company of the divine Astraea, heralding a new age of civilization and peace, was dedicated to Henry IV, to whom the monumental work of Olivier de Serres, *Le Théâtre d'Agriculture* of 1601, was also dedicated.⁸² These

pastoral and pacific allegories were dedicated to eloquence, rule by the word instead of by the club.

Hobbes's answer to Davenant's Preface to *Gondibert*, dedicated to him and his theories, shows the master much more attuned than his acolyte to French literary and rhetorical trends. For all that he campaigned against fairies and fantasms, Hobbes had no desire to extinguish the imagination: "fancy," and its works. It is from "fancy," "whence proceed those grateful similies, metaphors and other tropes, by which both *poets* and *orators* have it in their power to make things please or displease, and show well or ill to others, as they like themselves."⁸³ Leviathan's success lies in the economy of rhetoric. The sword-wielding Leviathan must combine the emblems of church and state on a mission of peace. If the project of the Gallic Hercules was a Counterreformation imperial dream, Hobbes's Leviathan was its antithesis: Protestant Prince, vanquisher of the many-headed papal and Presbyterian hydra, who would finally bring peace.

Now we see why Hobbes the materialist and crusader against fantasms dared to invoke images of Job and the *Apocrypha*, setting allegorical riddles officially ruled out by his theory for his followers to solve. Leviathan walked a tightrope between the Godly prince of protestantism and the God-king of pagan tradition. Multiple in its appeals, this synthetic figure, Gallic Hercules, Old Testament king, evocation of the humanist prince and the Book of Job, was as offensive to one tradition as it was attractive to another. Hobbes had overdone it. If "the tongue of man is a trumpet of warre, and sedition," the spectre of a French absolute monarch ruling like Pericles, who "by his elegant speeches thundered and lightend, and confounded whole Greece t'selfe,"⁸⁴ was more than the seventeenth century Englishman was prepared to take.

Hobbes indulged in insolent irony in invoking Lucian the rhetor, author of the notorious *Philosophies for Sale*.⁸⁵ He paints "rhetors, a vile race, drawn by greed of money and fanning ears to people proud but poor, who take nothing seriously unless told them by bearded philosophers with austere faces, their whole lives an affront to their own teachings."⁸⁶ Lucian, historian of the Gallic Hercules and rhetor who deplores all rhetoricians, is Hobbes, and Hobbes, author of *Leviathan*, is Lucian. If Leviathan is the French King, the Spanish Emperor, the Pope, and the Counterreformation league, that makes the English parliament, that nest of Presbyterians, Behemoth.

Hobbes had effected a set of startling reversals that only contrived to make him more heretical, more politically dangerous, and more theologically controversial. Given his irrepressible disposition, this could have been more or less intentional. For he had serious philosophical reasons for naming his books the way he did, which controversy sometimes obscured. Memory of the Old Testament creator God, the God of fear, could not be expunged from

the dispensation of the New Testament, he maintained; not only because of the reality of power politics—old states and old scores to settle—but, more seriously, due to the hermeneutics of power. Leviathan, as an awful figure of might, personated the Old Testament God who had built the world like a temple poised between worlds. Its storm walls and its starry roof were open for all to see. By such a show of strength, the creator God assailed men, who could not deny him or the Leviathans who personified his power—the latter like Beelzebub were beasts, but somehow part of the divine design. That Hobbes should have designated his own Christian commonwealth a Leviathan is as much an expression of his relentless honesty as it is of his desire to provoke. Like the kingdoms of old—as the creation of men no better and no worse—it was the sort of state one might expect a Henry IV to lead or, at one time, a Charles I.

NOTES

1. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*, 1989 ed., vol. 8, 869) gives several meanings for the term up to and including the seventeenth century including, firstly, a monster, in the seventeenth century meaning of marvel: "the name of an aquatic animal (real or imaginary) of enormous size, frequently mentioned in Hebrew poetry," as in 1382, Wyclif, Job xl[1.] 20 [21] Whether maist thou drawn out leuyethan with an hoc? 1535 Coverdale Ps ciii[i.] 26, There is that Leuiathan, whom thou hast made, to take his pastyme therin. 1555, Eden, Decades, To Rdr. (Arb.) 51 The greate serpente of the sea Leuiathan, to haue such dominion in the Ocean. 1591, Spenser, Vis. World's Van. 62, The huge Leuiathan, dame Natures wonder; secondly, "a man of wast and formidable power or enormous wealth": 1607, Dekker, Knts Conjur. 60, The lacquy of this great leuiathan promise he should be maister. c. 1630, Sanderson, Serm. II.310, So can the Lord deal . . . with the great . . . leviathans of the world; thirdly, "After Isaiah xxvii.I.) The great enemy of God, Satan": 1382 Wyclif, Isa. xxvii.I, In that dai viseten shal the Lord in his harde swerd . . . vp on leuyathan . . . a crookid wounde serpent. c. 1400 Destr. Troy 4423, This fende was the first that felle for his pride . . . that luyaton is cald. 1412-20, Lydg. Chron. Troy, II. xvii, The vile serpent the Leuiathan. 1447 Bokenham, Seytnys (Roxb.) 150, By the envye deceyvvyd of hys enemy Clepyd serpent behemoat or levyathan. 1595, B. Barnes, Spir. Sonn. li, Breake thou the jawes of old Levayathan, Victorious Conqueror; and fourthly, "attrib. passing into adj. when sense: Huge, monstrous: 1624, Middleton, Game at Chess, II. ii, This leviathan-scandal that lies rolling Upon the crystal waters of devotion. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) acknowledges that after 1651 the meaning of the term was changed forever, by Hobbes use of it to mean "The organism of political society, the commonwealth" (*OED*, 1989 ed., 869).

2. See Keith Brown, "The Artist of the *Leviathan* Title Page," *British Library Journal* 4, no. 2 (1978): 24-36; Arnold A. Rogow, *Thomas Hobbes: Radical in the Service of Reaction* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1986), 156-60; A. P. Martinich, *The Two Gods of Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 362-5; and Tracy Strong, "How to Write Scripture: Words, Authority, and Politics in Thomas Hobbes," *Critical Inquiry*, 20 (Autumn 1993): 128-59, esp. 128-30. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the Folger Institute of the Folger Shakespeare

Library and its staff, where I began this work and from whom I was the recipient of a grant-in-aid; to Larry Bryant, Alan Cromartie, Johann and Margaret Sommerville, and Patricia Harris Ståblein, my colleagues there, for useful discussion and assistance; to the Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., where as a Fellow for the 1993-4 academic year I have had the pleasure of completing it; and to the Editor and anonymous readers of this journal. I am indebted to Alan Cromartie for specific information on Herbert, Culverwell and the biblical commentaries; to Larry Bryant for his excellent work on the Gallic Hercules; and to Patricia Harris Ståblein for sources on big fish stories, including her own (unpublished) "No Whale Is an Island."

3. Iconographic investigations are less fruitful. Of the books consulted on monsters and marvellous beasts: Christopher Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971); C.J.S. Thompson, *The Mystery and Lore of Monsters* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1930); Heinz Mode, *Fabulous Beasts and Monsters* (London: Phaidon, 1975); Claude Kappler, *Monstres et Démons et Merveilles à la fin du Moyen Age* (Paris: Payot, 1980), only Mode makes mention of Leviathan or Behemoth. Mode (1975, 118, 119, 120, 153) reproduces the text of Isaiah 27:1, setting it in the context of a brief discussion of Tiamat and dragon figures of earlier Mesopotamian and Near Eastern literature, accompanied by an excellent line drawing of Leviathan (a dragon) and Behemoth (a hippopotamus) by William Blake, 1825, too late for our purposes. Even the compendious work of P. Gaspar Schott, S. J., *Physica Curiosa, sive Mirabilia naturae et artis* (1667), ranging from angels and demons to biological and astronomical marvels, includes no mention of Leviathan or Behemoth. This despite mention of Egyptian conjurors turning rods into serpents (Schott, 1667, bk. 1, chap. 20, 58); brief mention of Job 1:3 of the Book of the Apocalypse on the precursor to Antichrist (Schott, 1667, bk. 1, chap. 19, 51) and Isaiah 13:5, 20 on the extermination of the Babylonians and their place being taken by dragons (Schott, 1667, bk. 3, chap. 2, 360); and a chapter devoted to Egyptian monsters and deformities (Appendix to bk. 12, chap. 6, 1377-8), matters of related interest to Hobbes.

4. Strong, "How to Write Scripture," 147. Victoria Silver, in her "Critical Response, I: A Matter of Interpretation," *Critical Inquiry* 20 (Autumn, 1993): 160-71, argues against Strong that the Leviathan is a figure for "the world's fundamental intransigence—its resistance to explanation" (p. 164). This is, I think, quite wrong, if only, as I shall show, on the grounds of anachronism.

5. Quoted in Silver, "Critical Response," 164-5, as evidence of God flexing his muscles in the creation of Leviathan, symbol of the intransigence of the world and resistance to explanation.

6. *Leviathan*, 1, 1991 ed., 9.

7. *Ibid.*, chap. 17, 87, 1991 ed., 120.

8. *Ibid.*, 166, 1991 ed., 220

9. *Ibid.*, 166-7, 1991 ed., 220-1.

10. Strong, "How to Write Scripture," 132-3, 149.

11. *Ibid.* It is important to emphasize that Reformation epistemic revisions to the allegorical tradition of Catholicism represented an institutional challenge in the first instance, and philosophical changes only as a consequence. Allegorical interpretation had opened up a vast terrain of possible meanings, giving the Church the scope it needed to claim institutional authority over the sacred books. The Protestant attempt to claim the scriptures back for the common reader had its analogue in Hobbes's attempt to claim back civil society and its full array of institutions, including philosophy and government, from the domain of an imperial church. It represented at once a democratic appeal to the equality of all believers and an institutional counterclaim against the Church. For this reason, I think that Tracy Strong is right to see the Protestant position on the question of how we can know the scriptures as Hobbes's paradigm for how we can know God and, further, how we can know that civil government is divinely sanctioned. In each of these cases, "know" is the operative word, the "leap of faith" that Silver objects to and that Strong

reasserts. (See Strong's "Critical Response II: When Is a Text not a Pretext? A Rejoinder to Victoria Silver." *Critical Inquiry* 20 (Autumn 1993): 172-8, esp., 172-4). Seventeenth century propositions concerning matters for which we have even fewer guidelines than for understanding scripture do not lend themselves to redescription as, for instance, "'interpreting' the existence of God," or "'interpreting' the legitimacy of the sovereign." Semantically incongruous and politically dangerous, they offer no warrant for the redescription "'interpreting' the Bible," either, language that exegetes are careful not to use.

12. For Hobbes's preoccupation with disempowering the Church, see Patricia Springborg, "Hobbes on Religion," in the *Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, ed. by Tom Sorrell (Cambridge, forthcoming); and "Hobbes, Heresy and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*," *Journal of the History of Ideas* (October 1994). On anti-clericalism as the obsession in the age of Locke, see J.A.I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

13. Theodore Beza, *Job Expovnded by Theodore Beza, Partly in Manner of a Commentary, Partly in Manner of a Paraphrase* (Cambridge, 1589, STC 2020), Dedicatorie, 4.

14. *Ibid.*, 8-9.

15. Edward Herbert, *The Ancient Religion of the Gentiles and Causes of Errors Considered* (London: 1705 ed.; Folger Library, 153296), 134. English translation of *De religione gentilis, errorumque apud eos causis* (Amsterdam, 1663; Folger Library: 150363.B1805).

16. Nathaniel Culverwell, *An Elegant and Learned Discourse of the Light of Nature* (1646), ed. by Robert A. Green and High MacCallum (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 41.

17. Theodore Beza, *Job Expovnded*, Dedicatorie, 4-5.

18. Hugh Broughton, an Hebraist and scholar, noted in his title the time he expended on interpretation compared with translation: Hugh Broughton, *Job. To the King. A Colon-Agrippina studie of one moneth, for the metricall translation. But of Many Yeres, for Ebrew Difficulties. Part 2 is Job. Brought on to familiar dialogue and paraphrase for easier entendement* (n.p., 1610, STC 3868). He skips over Job, chapters 38 to 42, with the general comment that God's point here is to teach people: on the one hand, that his demonstrations of power are visible; on the other, that probing them too deeply for meaning is a show of pride of just the sort for which Job took our punishment. Broughton's comment amounts to a confession of failure with this particular set of "'ebrew difficulties," which is to say that he is more open than most of his contemporary commentators (*Ibid.*, 144). This translation, with a political purpose no doubt, had been made for King James I. Earlier, in his translation of *The Lamentation of Jeremy* (1606, 34), dedicated to "Henry, Prince of Great Britany," Broughton had cross-referenced the dragon and ostrich of chapter 4:3 of the Lamentations ("Even the Dragons open their breast, they give suck to their whelps: the daughter of my people is like the cruell: as the ostrich in the wildernes") to the unicorn of Job 39:14, suggesting some unfathomable association between these apocalyptic beasts. The choice of Job and the Lamentations of Jeremiah as texts for royal dedication could, as in the case of Beza, simply be to exhort the Prince to constancy and courage in times of trial, with no particular, or negative, focus on the apocalyptic content, as the Broughton's subtitle for the *Lamentations* (1606), which "Stirreth all to attention of God's Ordered Providence in Kingdomes confusion," would suggest.

19. George Abbott, *The Whole Booke of Job Paraphrased, or Made easie for any to understand* (London, 1640, STC 41), 256, 259.

20. Jean Oecolampadius, *Exposition de M. Iean Oecolompade svr le Livre de Job*. Traduit de Latin en François (Edition premiere, Geneve, 1562, Folger Library 218-628q), 487.

21. *Ibid.*, 488-9. Oecolampadius' account is one of the most comprehensive surveys of interpretatons of Behemoth and Leviathan in Bible commentaries.

22. Job 40:17.

23. Behemoth's tail stiff like a Cedar in the Book of Job, would have been read as a figure for Lebanon.

24. John Calvin, *Sermons of Maister Iohn Calvin, vpon the Booke of Iob*, trans. Arthur Golding (London, 1584 STC 4447), 730b, 43ff.

25. *Ibid.*, 731a, 4-11.

26. *Ibid.*, 731a, 16-21.

27. *Ibid.*, 732b, 33ff.

28. *Ibid.*, 732a, 53ff: "Howbeit before I goe any further, wheras here is so long a discourse vpon the said king of beasts of the land whiche I said was an Elephant, (albeit that it bee named here by the general terme of Behemoth) & also vpon the Leuiathan: we haue to marke therupon how men haue bin of opinion, that by an allegory the diuel is spoken of here, rather than either the Elephant or the Whale, and that they haue gone aboute to proue that fanastical deuse of theirs by this, that in the end is said, that the said whale is the king of the children of pride."

29. *Ibid.*, 733a, 6-11: "Neuertheles truely, by conueying the discourse from the one to the other, a man might as wel vse this similitude of the Whales and Elephantes, to make men perceiue how greatly the power of the Deuil ought to fray vs, seeing he is termed the prince of the ayre and of the world."

30. The most common usage of the words "allegory," "allegorical" up to and including the sixteenth century, was to designate a particular tradition of biblical interpretation, Tyndale in his *Obedience of a Christian Man*, of 1528 (Works, vol. I, 303) declaring: "They diuide the scripture in four senses, the literal, tropological, allegorical and analogical." Wyclif, on Gal. 4:24, remarked elliptically, "The whiche thingis ben seid by allegorie, or goostly undirstandinge." W. Fulke (*Heskins. Parliament*, 1579, 11) referred to "wicked allegorizing vpon the scriptures"; and, in the same vein, Jortin (Serm, 1571, 1771 ed., I.i.2), declared: "The Pagan Philosophers fell into the Allegorizing way," *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989 ed., vol. 1, 333.

31. Calvin, 1584 ed., 733b, 11ff, 28ff; "If we beare away this singlenes, it will stand vs in better steed then all curious expositions that canne be deused, as when these Allegorimakers serched out his ribs & backbones, & treated also of his skin & of this & that, & to be short, there was not that peece of him, wherein they found not some toy or other. But this is as it were to make the holy scripture a nose of waxe, by transfourming it from the natural sense."

32. John Calvin, *A Commentary vpon the Prophecie of Isaiah* (Translated out of French . . . by C. C. London (1609, STC 4396), 260b.

33. *The Reformation Writings of Martin Luther*. Translated from the definitive Weimar edition by Bertram Lee Wolf (London: Lutterworth Press. 1956, 2 vols.), vol. 2, 231.

34. Ps. 58:4.

35. Ps. 22:21.

36. Ps. 7:2.

37. Jer. 5:3.

38. Ps. 74:13

39. Luther, *The Reformation Writings*, 1956 ed., vol. 2, 232.

40. *Ibid.*

41. Hobbes's challenge is issued in his "Animadversions upon the Bishop's Epistle to the Reader," in *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. by Sir William Molesworth (London, 1839-45; 11 vols, referred to as E.W.), vol. 5, 25-6, prefacing *The Questions Concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance, Clearly Stated and Debated between Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derby and Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury* (1654). It is interesting to speculate at what point Hobbes decided to use the title Behemoth himself, the work that was completed in 1668 and published only in 1679. Hobbes is mute on the significance of its title, at which we can only guess. Did the

Long Parliament in any way resemble Behemoth as a figure for the Assyrians, land of Nebuchadnezzar and the Tower of Babel?

42. John Bramhall, *Castigations of Mr. Hobbes his Last Animadversions, in the Case Concerning Liberty and Universal Necessity. With an Appendix Concerning the Catching of LEVIATHAN, or the Great Whale* (London, 1658, STC B4215), Preface, ii.

43. *Ibid.*, iii: "I do believe there never was any Authour Sacred or Profane, Ancient or Moderne, Christian, Jew, Mahumetan, or Pagan, that hath inveighed so frequently and so bitterly against all feigned phantasmes, with their first devisers, maintainers, and receivers, as T. H. hath done, excluding out of the nature of things the souls of Men, Angels, Devils, and all incorporeal Substances, as fictions, phantasmes, and groundlesse contradictions. Many men fear the meaning of it is not good, that God himself must be gone for company, as being an incorporeal substance, except men will vouchsafe by God to understand nature. So much T. H. himself seemeth to intimate."

44. Brown, "The Artist of the *Leviathan*"; Strong, "How to Write Scripture."

45. *OED*: sea monster, half man half fish. There was a long tradition of big fish stories, in Norse, French Romance, Celtic, and Old English legend, and other folklore far afield. See, Cornelia Catlin Coulter, "The 'Great Fish' in Ancient and Medieval Story," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 57 (1926): 32-50; Michael N. Nagler, "Beowulf in the Context of Myth," in *Old English Literature in Context*, ed. by J. D. Niles (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Little field, 1980), 143-56; S. J. Parsons, "Lest Men Like Fishes . . .," *Traditio* 3 (1946): 381-8.

46. Bramhall, *Castigations of Mr. Hobbes*, iv.

47. *Ibid.* Bramhall expands on his image: "My first dart is aimed at his heart, or Theological part of his discourse, to shew that his principles are not consistent either with Christianity, or any other Religion. The second dart is aimed at the chine [*OED*: backbone], whereby this vast body is united and fitted for aminal motion, that is, the political part of his discourse; to shew that his principles are pernicious to all formes of Government, and all Societies, and destroy all relations between man and man. The third dart is aimed at his head or rational part of his discourse; to shew that his principles are inconsistent with themselves, and contradict one another. Let him take heed, if these three darts do pierce his *Leviathan* home, it is not all the Dittany [*OED*: peppermint, cure for monsters] which groweth in Creet that can make them drop easily out of his body, without the utter overthrow of his cause."

48. *Ibid.*

49. For more detailed studies of Hobbes on these particular religious doctrines see the following pieces by Patricia Springborg, "Leviathan and the Problem of Ecclesiastical Authority," *Political Theory* 3, no. 3 (1975): 289-303; "Leviathan, the Christian Commonwealth Incorporated," *Political Studies* 24, no. 2 (1976): 171-83.

50. Thomas Hobbes, *Historia ecclesiastica carmine elegiaco concinnata*, ed. with a preface by Thomas Rymer (London: Andrew Crooke, 1688). English paraphrase, *A True Ecclesiastical History From Moses to the time of Martin Luther, in Verse* (London, 1722), lines 1225-35, 1688 ed., 57, 1722 paraphrase, pp. 97-100.

51. This is the spirit of Tracy Strong's description of the frontispiece in "How to Write Scripture," 130.

52. Henry VIII claimed a super-king role in medieval mystical body language "We as head and you as members, we are conjoined and bound together in one body politic," cited by Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), 228; but even he does not quite qualify for the might and terror of *Leviathan*.

53. Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, trans. C. H. Oldfather (London: Heinemann, Loeb ed., 1935), 4.19, 405.
54. Cited by Corrado Vivanti, "Henry IV, The Gallic Hercules," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967): 185.
55. Lucian, "Heracles," in *Works*, ed. by A. M. Harmon (London: Heinemann, Loeb ed., 1913), vol. 1, 63.
56. *Ibid.*, 65.
57. *Ibid.*, §3-6, 1913 ed., 65-7.
58. *Leviathan*, 1991 ed., 147; noted by Quentin Skinner, "Thomas Hobbes on the Proper Signification of Liberty," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 40 (1990): 121-51.
59. For this account of Henry IV as the Gallic Hercules, I am indebted to Lawrence M. Bryant, "Politics, Ceremonies, and Embodiments of Majesty in Henry II's France," in *European Monarchy, its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992) 127-54.
60. *Ibid.*, 136-7.
61. Lucian, "Heracles," 5, 1913 ed., 67.
62. Bryant, "Politics, Ceremonies, and Embodiments," 140.
63. *Ibid.*, 136.
64. Jean Bodin, *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale*, trans. R. Knolles (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 503, 506, cited Bryant, "Politics, Ceremonies, and Embodiments," 135-6.
65. Bodin, *The Six Bookes*, 3.3, 378, cited Bryant, "Politics, Ceremonies, and Embodiments," 141-2.
66. R. E. Hallowell, "Ronsard and the Gallic Hercules Myth," *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962); cited Bryant, "Politics, Ceremonies, and Embodiments," 141 n. 47.
67. Bryant, "Politics, Ceremonies, and Embodiments," 150.
68. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), 498 n. 6.
69. Bryant, "Politics, Ceremonies, and Embodiments," 144-5.
70. *Leviathan*, 1991 ed., 80-1.
71. *Ibid.*, 241.
72. Polybius, 6.7.9-6.9.1.
73. Vivanti, "Henry IV, The Gallic Hercules," 190.
74. As Tracy Strong has pointed out.
75. Vivanti, "Henry IV, The Gallic Hercules," 177-8.
76. *Ibid.*, 179-83.
77. See Jean Seznec, *La Survivance des dieux antiques* (Paris, 1940), 28ff, cited Vivanti, "Henry IV," 183.
78. Antonio Ricciardo Brixiano, *Commentaria Symbolica...in quibus explicantur arcana pene infinita ad mysticam, naturalem et occultam rerum significationem attentia* (Venice 1591, 33), cited Vivanti, "Henry IV," 184.
79. Antonio la Penna, *Orazio e l'ideologia del principato* (Turin, 1963), 180-1; Ernst Bloch, *Les Rois Thaumaturges* (Paris, 1961), cited Vivanti, "Henry IV," 180-1. Rousseau referred to Hobbes as that "Christian author," who united the two heads of the eagle, *The Social Contract*, 1762, bk. 4, chap. 8, trans. Maurice Cranston (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 180.
80. Vivanti, "Henry IV," 190.
81. Isaac Casaubon, *Epistolae...eiusdem deicationes, praefationes, prolegomena* (Rotterdam, 1709), vol. 1, 87; cited Vivanti, "Henry IV," 193-4.
82. Vivanti, "Henry IV," 194-5.

83. See Hobbes's Answer to "The Author's Preface to his much honour'd Friend Mr Hobs," by Sir William D'Avenant, and Hobbes's Answer, in *Gondibert: an Heroick Poem* (London, 1651, STC D325), 78-9.

84. Hobbes, *De Cive*, chap. 5, on Imperium, in *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. by Sir William Molesworth (11 vols, London, 1839-1845, referred to as E.W.), vol. 1, 88.

85. I thank the anonymous reader of this journal for reminding me of the title of Lucian's other famous work. For the Lucianic tradition more generally, see D. Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

86. Hobbes added, while "anyone who decries the priests is hunted down as a blasphemmer, atheist, heretic." *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lines 385-460, 1688 ed., 19-22; 1722 ed., 28-33.

Patricia Springborg teaches in the Department of Government at the University of Sydney. A Woodrow Wilson International Scholar in 1994-95, she is now a Guest Fellow at the Brookings Institution as the recipient of a MacArthur Foundation Research and Writing Grant.