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**HOBBES AND NATURAL LAW IN CONTEXT**

To deepen our understanding of Thomas Hobbes’s political thought I place Hobbes’s account of natural law (as presented in *Leviathan*)in historical context. I will first discuss what I call the “Pauline framework” within which many early-to-mid-seventeenth–century (1620–51) Englishmen (mostly clerics) debated, and contested natural law. Next, I will place Hobbes’s discussion of natural law within this framework.

Examining Hobbes’s account of natural law in context does not lead me to conclude that Hobbes’s formulation is merely a reflection of his time. As I will illustrate, Hobbes’s account is unusual from both Reformed and Catholic perspectives. Reformed Protestant clerics who discussed natural law within the Pauline framework compared the significance of natural law against Scripture and the need for Christ. They concluded that natural law was imperfect and not significant for Reformed Christians because Scripture perfected and in effect replaced natural law. Through his sacrifice, Christ fulfilled the law. Reformed Christians therefore placed natural law in the shadows and highlighted faith and grace. Hobbes is unusual—and perhaps heretical—from this perspective because he emphasizes the deep significance of natural law in Reformation England. But the significance he attaches to natural law does not rest on the fact that it leads men to loftier ends like God or opens the door to salvation through obedient works (i.e., the Catholic position). Worldly concerns like self-preservation and sovereign authorization are the central foci of Hobbes’s account of natural law, and English Catholics would find this shift in focus highly unusual and, again, perhaps even heretical.

In many other important respects, however, Hobbes’s account of natural law is far less original than contemporary scholars claim. My account of Hobbesian natural law begins by challenging scholars who claim that Hobbes’s all-but-Godless discussion of natural law is a radical departure from the way many devout English Christians across the religious spectrum conceptualized the natural man who was subject to natural law.[[1]](#footnote-2) English clerics repeatedly argued that natural law was the moral standard for heathens who did not know—and therefore did not believe in—the true Christian God. It was commonplace to claim that natural law was the morality of the Godless or the morality of atheists, or those who worshipped false gods, including idols of their own making.

Second, my account of natural law challenges scholars who suggest that we must choose between construing Hobbes’s natural law as a proto-Kantian a priori dictate of reason or as a prudential rule generated from man’s will (i.e., determining appetite) to avoid violent death. [[2]](#footnote-3) The Pauline framework located natural law in reason and conscience, in will and appetite. These were different natural faculties that worked together to provide natural men with a moral orientation. The relevant distinction and hierarchy for Reformed clerics who were working within the Pauline framework was between natural and supernatural faculties, not reason and will.

Third, I challenge the position that Hobbesian natural law is novel or at least unusual because it breaks with morality and ushers in a base, interest-oriented modernity focused on self-preservation. Denigrating natural law by refusing to construe it as the ultimate moral touchstone and by demeaning its substantive content is fundamental to the natural-law framework that Reformed Protestants used in Hobbes’s time. Associating natural law with self-preservation is not novel.[[3]](#footnote-4) Aligning it with self-preservation does not void it altogether of moral content.[[4]](#footnote-5) We can interpret Hobbes’s preservation-oriented conception of natural law as supporting the beliefs of devout Christians working within the Pauline moral framework of the English Reformation. This religious framework aligned natural morality with meaningful but rudimentary secular concerns in order to establish the superiority of Scripture, faith and spirit over natural law.

Finally, I challenge the suggestion that Hobbes is being devious and revealing his atheism when he bumbles his way through the status of natural law as law; or when he contradicts himself in his discussions of the binding nature of the law; or when he derives ought from is.[[5]](#footnote-6) The ambiguities we find in Hobbes’s discussion of these issues are the very ambiguities that devout clerics were grappling with in their own discussions of natural law. The allegedly devious passages about natural law in *Leviathan* might not suggest atheism or a secular world view; they might suggest that Hobbes was seriously engaging vexing questions about the place and significance of natural law in Reformed Protestant, faith-centered England while advancing his own political project.

1. **Mid-Seventeenth–Century English Natural Law in Time and Space**

**Natural Law in Time**

When constructing their conceptions of natural law, many Englishmen located the concept outside history in the transcendental realm.[[6]](#footnote-7) But an ahistorical conception of natural law is not the only conception Englishmen presented. Nor is it the hegemonic one.[[7]](#footnote-8) Sacred history was a temporal framework within which many Englishmen constructed their conceptions of natural law. According to this framework, time was divided into three periods. The first was the period of nature and nature or its law governed. This period ran roughly from Adam to Moses. The second period was the period of law. The Decalogue ruled from the time of Moses to Christ. The third period was that of grace and the Gospels reigned from Christ until His second coming.[[8]](#footnote-9)

Romans 2 grounded the temporal division that associated nature and/or natural law with the first period of sacred history. In the second letter to the Romans, Paul talked about Gentiles who did not know the law (the Decalogue) because they lived before Moses. Paul said these Gentiles will “do by nature the things contained in the law;” they have “the work of the law written in their hearts” (Rom. 2:14–15).

The most prevalent interpretation of these passages assumed that Paul was addressing the question of salvation. The Gentiles living before Moses will be judged by a particular time-bound standard. They will not be judged by the Decalogue (the Jews will be), or by their faith in Christ (as individuals living after Christ will be).[[9]](#footnote-10) They will be judged according to nature or nature’s law. For example, Nicholas Byfield, a leading preacher in the age of James I, wrote: “Considering the Gentiles without the Law brought to them, they shall be judged, not by the Law written (which thy had not) but by the Law of nature, which they had in their hearts, Rom 2.15.16.”[[10]](#footnote-11) Likewise, John Rogers stated, “As for them that have not the Word, their conscience judge by the light and law of nature, which was left man after the fall (for there remain some general notions in mans heart both of the first and second table).”[[11]](#footnote-12) Finally, in a sermon preached in 1629, bishop and scholar Lancelot Andrewes, who held high office under James I and oversaw the translation of the King James Bible, stated that the “law of nature . . . [was] given . . . to the old world, long before the law came in any tables.”[[12]](#footnote-13)

Controversy attended this temporal framework because it assumed that there were men who were saved through obedient works. This doctrine of works implied free will and seemed Catholic or Arminian leaning. For Calvinist-leaning Protestants, if works could save men, what need was there for Christ the Redeemer, for the doctrine of grace or for the doctrine of justification through faith? Responding to this troubling implication, nonconforming clergyman Anthony Burgess, who preached to the parliamentary garrison during the English civil wars, wrote, “Our divines do well to reprove the papists, for calling all that time from Adam to Moses, a state, or law of nature.”[[13]](#footnote-14) But, if Burgess was right, if individuals were saved only by their faith, what need was there for a moral law? In addition, if men were saved by faith, did this mean that those living before Christ were damned? Or did only God’s chosen people (e.g., Noah, Abraham) have enough faith in God or the prefigured messiah to be saved? Or, did God save and not save arbitrarily at will? These were all highly controversial questions that Englishmen associated with their discussion of natural law in the mid-seventeenth century.

**Natural Law in Space**

Divine geography was another historical framework within which Englishmen conducted their natural-law discussions and debates. According to this framework, all peoples and places were divided in two. There were those people and places where Scripture was known and those where Scripture was unknown. In the former, the Word was the moral standard. In the latter, nature or natural law governed. Englishmen emphasized natural law’s binding character on a particular subset of inferior people (those outside the Decalogue or the Christian church) living in remote locales. Cleric Samuel Purchas, who published reports written by men who travelled abroad, wrote, “Being asked of them which are *now* in the law of nature, to whom no knowledge of the Gospell hath come. . . . I believe that God also hath provided for them, that by some means they may be saved, when they shall have kept the precepts of Nature.”[[14]](#footnote-15)

Englishmen who read about or who observed those who lacked all awareness of Scripture called them godless men, pagans, or heathens. Byfield wrote that God “will judge Pagans . . . by the law of nature. . . . All the wicked men [presumably the pagans] are chiefly tried . . . by the Law of Nature . . . by the principles infused into every mans mind by Nature as the Pagans and all that know not the Scripture . . . see Rom 2:12.”[[15]](#footnote-16) Natural philosopher and leading Roman Catholic intellectual Sir Kenelm Digby hypothesized, “If we were no Christians but Heathens . . . [something] would bind us, which is the law of nature.”[[16]](#footnote-17) Likewise, Rogers wrote, “Such as live out of the Church, and never heard of Christ, neither was his word preached among them, they must be judged by the law of nature Rom 2.12.14.15 and the covenant of works.”[[17]](#footnote-18)Men outside the church could be heathens, or they could be atheists. Richard Braithwaite explained natural law was the moral standard for those “who were heathens, and knew no God.”[[18]](#footnote-19) In a sermon preached at St. Mary’s Oxford, philosopher Nathaniel Carpenter said, “[The] pagan drowned in the ditch of ignorance, and so nussled up in the school of impiety, [is a man] to whose soul and secret apprehension God himself dictates . . . a law of nature.”[[19]](#footnote-20)

1. **Conceptions of the Natural Man Who is Governed by Natural Law**

Englishmen went to some lengths to describe the men who were governed by the imperfect standard of nature, not the perfected standard of Scripture. In constructing their accounts, they remained within the Pauline framework. When Paul wrote about natural men, his letters drew a distinction and forged a hierarchy between what was natural and what was spiritual. The natural man was imperfect and inferior to the spiritual Christian. In 1 Corinthians, Paul said the “natural” is “earthy,” not “spiritual” (1 Cor. 15:46–48). In Ephesians 2, he said poor Gentiles who are “without God in the world” are “in the flesh.” In 2 Corinthians, he explained that when natural men hear of “spiritual things,” they misinterpret them as absurd speech—as “foolishness” because natural faculties cannot grasp what is “spiritually discerned” (2 Cor. 2:14).

 Brathwaite develops his degrading account of natural man in this Pauline fashion. The “[h]eathen knew no God . . . and he only partake[s] [of] some weak glimpse of a natural light . . . kn[owing] not what eternity meant; nor where that Heavenly city was to be found.”[[20]](#footnote-21) That is, natural man is Godless (he doesn’t know the true God) and can’t know about the afterlife (a spiritual matter). The Catholic Cardinal Jacques Du Perron, who gave Queen Mary’s eulogy and whose works were published in England in the mid-seventeenth century, stays within the Pauline framework because he too emphasizes natural man’s inferior earthy nature. For Du Perron, natural man is a crude version of what he has become in sacred time. Unlike the Christian, natural man is a creature of appetite bound to terrestrial objects who possesses a mortal soul:

The visible church had three periods, the first under nature; the second under the law, and third under grace. . . . Which is as if one should say, there are three periods in the progress of the generation of man. The first during the which man . . . is yet touched with no other instinct than simple appetite, which the philosophers call natural . . . which seems to correspond to the condition of the first period of the church, wherein she had yet no law or rule, but the simple law of nature. . . . [Natural men] stick . . . [to] terrestrial and material objects. . . . Under the first . . . period, the imperfect soul of man . . . is subject to perish, corruptible and mortal.[[21]](#footnote-22)

Like the Catholic Du Perron, William Prynne associated those governed by the “grounds and principles of nature” with the crude material world: they were “carnal men.”[[22]](#footnote-23)

Likewise, clergyman John Reading denigrated natural man and wrote, “The natural man in this existence neither doth receive, nor can know the things of Gods spirit: so that he wanteth . . . the use of diverse principles necessary to lead and guide him in the way of sanctity . . . he had [only] . . . a . . . law of nature.”[[23]](#footnote-24) Protecting Scripture, Reading stays within the Pauline framework and denigrates natural man by claiming that he lacks the spiritual faculties that provide a way to sanctity. Only Scripture and a spiritually infused reading of it can provide the path to a good life. The nonconforming John Saltmarsh continues to degrade natural man by staying within the Pauline track. Natural man was “under pupillage and bondage to nature and the law of nature. . . . [But] the Christian is one who should live in a higher region then flesh or nature. . . . [The Christian should live] in spirit.”[[24]](#footnote-25) Natural man lives and learns within the boundary of the material world; he exercises limited natural faculties. By contrast, the Christian goes beyond matter using supernatural faculties like belief and faith; through these, but not through reason or passion, he reaches the realm of spirit.

Adding a slight twist to this spiritless and Godless conception of natural man, some Englishmen claimed the latter had knowledge of the true God. All agreed, however, that this knowledge was inadequate and rudimentary, especially when compared to what Christians knew of Him. This reading of a God-aware natural man differed from the others, but it also had Pauline roots. Paul claimed natural men could grasp God as the “eternal power” “from the creation of the world,” that is, natural man grasped God as the supreme power or cause of nature. They found their way to God through “the things that are made” (Rom. 1:20). Paul also asserted that natural man stumbled when searching for God and proceeded to worship idols. Instead of glorifying God as the powerful cause or author of nature, natural man revealed his imperfection by “chang[ing] the glory of . . . God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things” (Rom. 2.21–24). Instead of worshipping God, natural man worshipped natural things, including things constructed from their natural imaginations.

These assumptions helped the Anglican Bishop of Gloucester, Godfrey Goodman, assert that men who possess only the faculty of “sense, reason and nature” practice a crude “natural religion, which in effect is no more, then the religion of dumbe beasts.”[[25]](#footnote-26) The theologian and president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Thomas Jackson, could flesh out this dumb and beastly religion. In the “refuse of barbarians,” where we must assume “the very worst (such as for their rudeness hardly be discerned from brute beasts) we find men acknowledging “Gods superior powers, whom they honor with sacrifice & other rights. . . . [Their religious rituals show] the signification of . . . an invisible power.”[[26]](#footnote-27) The natural God was the God of power, but natural men worshipped His natural creations or their own creations instead of Him. Scottish theologian George Gillespie, who was sent to the Westminster Assembly to represent Scottish Presbyterian concerns, could use the Pauline natural-law framework to assert, “Now by the law of nature . . . there are Magistrates among those who know nothing of Christ . . . though God reigneth over them by the Kingdom of power.”[[27]](#footnote-28)

1. **Natural Morality as Amorality or as Morality**

Now what of natural morality? How did religious Englishmen in the mid-seventeenth–century conceptualize the “law” governing this natural man? On this point, Paul’s writings pointed in two irreconcilable directions. The first path enabled Englishmen to assert that natural law was *no law at all*.

Many passages in Paul helped Englishmen conclude that the time or state of nature (construed either temporally or geographically) was amoral or a time of moral relativism. In Romans 2:12, Paul wrote the Gentiles were “without law.” In Romans 2:14, he wrote: “the Gentiles . . . have not the law. . . . Having not the law, [they] are a law unto themselves.” In Acts 14:16, it was stated that “in times past” God “suffered all nations to walk in their own ways.” In Acts 17:30, the “times of ignorance” are a period when God “winked at” men (meaning He excused them). Paul’s writings could also support the claim that sin did not exist in the lawless natural state. “Sin is not imputed when there is no law” (Rom. 5:13). “Where no law is, there is no transgression” (Rom. 5:13). “Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them *that had not sinned*. . . . By the offense of one [Adam]” (Rom. 5:14–18; emphasis added).

Some radical English sectarians adopted the view that natural man lacked morality. Other Christians forcefully rejected this view. For example, Andrewes disagreed with the amoral account but he acknowledged it, writing “Some there are that argue out of the Acts, and excuse ignorance, alledging [*sic*]. . . that God winked at the times of ignorance, and so make it no sin.”[[28]](#footnote-29) Andrew Willet, who wrote works against Catholics like Robert Bellarmine, supported the amoral interpretation of the natural state and revealed its deficiency. For Willet, the positive law of the Decalogue perfected the natural condition by adding morality to it:

The Law [the Decalogue] was given as a supply of the weakness and ignorance of men: that whereas there was no certain rule before, to know what was good, what was evil, but men according to their blind fancies and carnal imaginations, placed happiness sometimes in one thing, some in another: the law was to correct their erroneous opinions, and to teach one constant and sure rule of truth and virtue. . . . To take away all excuse . . . of ignorance, the Lord gave his written law.[[29]](#footnote-30)

Willet is telling readers that the natural condition of moral relativism was the consequence of the invincible moral ignorance that he attributes to the absence of Scripture. X concurs with Willet’s account and assessment of the imperfect natural state: “In the first state called, the law of nature as God had not given them any written form of Religion or Law, there was no set order . . . but every one followed their internal instinct and inspiration of God. . . . But afterward . . . God gave unto his people a written law.”[[30]](#footnote-31) For X, sacred history revealed a transition from the imperfect condition of moral chaos to the perfected condition of moral order through the introduction of positive law (the Decalogue issued by the civil sovereign Moses).

The famous Puritan theologian John Goodwin also confronted the known but controversial amoral account of life lived in the natural state prior to the coming of the positive law of Scripture*.* Goodwin concedes that Paul says “where no law is, there is no transgression” (Rom. 4:15) and he claims that Paul’s “meaning (as he expresseth himself upon the account in the chapter following, vers. 13) [is] that sin is not imputed . . . where there is no Law.” But Goodwin encourages his readers to follow him by rejecting the interpretation that supposes: “The world to have been absolutely lawless, and that the generality of men might without contracting any guilt, or making themselves liable unto punishment, have committed all the abominations, which they did commit . . . until the times of the Gospel.”[[31]](#footnote-32) Goodwin does *not* want his readers to read the words “[At] *the times of this ignorance God winked at”* men to import: “[That] God had neither taken, nor meant to take, any account at all of those Heathens, who, before the times of the Gospel, had only the Books of Nature, Providence, and Creation, to instruct them, for their misdemeanors in sinning.” Some argued that “Paul’s intent” was to establish natural amorality in order to “extenuate the sins of men,” and Goodwin urged his readers to reject this controversial but Pauline-rooted interpretation of the natural state.[[32]](#footnote-33)

The view that some form of morality (albeit an imperfect form) existed in the state of nature before the arrival of Scripture was the second path Englishmen took when considering natural morality in light of Paul’s teachings. To encourage his readers to adopt it instead of the competing view, Goodwin wrote, “We must of necessity make or suppose them subject to some law, or other of God.”[[33]](#footnote-34) As Andrewes wrote, “They lived not before Moses, without a Law. They had . . . all the moral Law written in their hearts . . . as Saint Paul saith.”[[34]](#footnote-35)

1. **The Form and Content of Natural Morality**

**The Form of Natural Morality**

Let us for a moment side with Goodwin and Andrewes in the controversy and assume that God did write morality into natural man’s heart. This assumption brings us no closer to grasping what form this morality took. Protecting Scripture, Scottish Presbyterian Samuel Rutherford was adamant that natural law did not take the form of a positive law issued as a command from God. It was not “the positive will of God.” He was merely “the author of the Law of nature, because he is the creator of that humane [*sic*] nature, in which the law is written.”[[35]](#footnote-36) For Rutherford, perfect Scripture reflects God’s declared will; imperfect natural law reflects God’s *authorship*. Burgess echoed Rutherford’s assertion that natural morality was not God’s positive law or positive command: the Gentiles were “without a written law”; they were “a law without a law; a law written but not declared.”[[36]](#footnote-37)

Burgess then approached the vexing question of natural law’s form more directly: “How this law is said to be written in the hearts? . . . There is . . . a two-fold writing in the hearts of men: the first, of knowledge and judgment, whereby they apprehend what is good and bad; the second is in the will and affections, by giving a propensity and delight, with some measure of strength.”[[37]](#footnote-38)

Burgess presents natural morality as a set of a priori rational principles lodged in the mind or in the conscience, *and* as an appetite or passion located in the will. For Burgess, the rational principles are “those common notions and maxims, which are ingraffed in all mens hearts . . . we cannot give any reasons of them; but as the Sun manifests it selfe by its owne light, so doe these.”[[38]](#footnote-39) These principles give men the capacity to possess moral knowledge and to make moral judgments. The natural inclinations are those that “enclineth the heart to good . . . shewing what is to be desired.”[[39]](#footnote-40) These moral inclinations enable men to will the good and to act on the good. Combined, these human faculties give natural men a moral orientation, but they pale in comparison with the spiritual faculty of faith and the moral orientation provided by grace and the Gospel.

Because many Englishmen conceived of natural law as a principle of reason and/or as an instinct or appetite working together, it is not uncommon to find them blurring the distinction between these two faculties and creating no hierarchy between them. For example, James Sharpe, an English Jesuit and professor of Scripture, stated, “In former ages, He [God] prescribed the *instinct of natural reason* in the law of nature.”[[40]](#footnote-41) Likewise, Willet used “precepts” of reason and “instinct” interchangeably when discussing natural law: “There are by nature printed in the mind of man . . . *precepts*: . . . [and] God . . . revive[d], *this natural instinct* by the prescript of his law [the Decalogue].”[[41]](#footnote-42) Lord Bishop of Derby George Downame, chaplain to King James VI, asserted that the “the instinct of nature” “thinks.”[[42]](#footnote-43) Antiquary Henry Spelman also used reason and instinct interchangeably: “The Law of Nature . . . is also called the law of *reason*, and it is written in the heart. . . . This is that law written in the hearts of the Heathen, made them to be a law unto themselves, as it is said, *Rom.* 2:14, and by the *instinct* of nature, to doe the very works of the Law of God [Scripture].”[[43]](#footnote-44)

What is clear from these passages is the distinction between instinct and reason was not the relevant distinction for these men. Nor did they fuss about ordering reason and instinct, as Platonists, Aristotelians, Stoics, or Scholastics do. These faculties were all natural faculties and they worked together to create a moral orientation in man; what was significant about these faculties is they were inferior to the supernatural or spiritual faculties that Englishmen attributed to Christians.

**The Content of Natural Law**

When Englishmen addressed the content of natural law, the distinction they forged between Scripture and nature led them to degrade natural law further. In their accounts, natural law did not place constraints upon the positive laws issued by Moses in the Decalogue or those promulgated by the Apostles or Christ in the Gospels. Natural law was not the ultimate moral touchstone for Reformed Englishmen; it did not set the normative standard from which to judge the merits of all positive law.[[44]](#footnote-45) Compared to Scripture, the content of natural law was meaningful but incomplete. As Burgess put it: “It is true, this light of Nature, comparatively to that of faith, is but as a glow-worme to the Sun; yet some light and irradiation it hath.”[[45]](#footnote-46) Nature’s content was incomplete and inferior to the positive laws articulated in Scripture because, generally speaking, natural law attended to and governed carnal matters only.[[46]](#footnote-47) Scripture’s content was superior because it enlarged its sphere of governance to include a rich spiritual domain.

For example, Rutherford wrote, “Things [that] are good in so mean a degree of goodness . . . the light of nature alone, maketh these actions in the sight of God allowable [or prohibited] . . . [but] nature is no sufficient director of what we should do to attain life eternal.” Moreover, one rudimentary good advanced by nature was self-preservation: natural law prohibits men from “hat[ing] their own flesh” (Rutherford means natural prohibits acts of self-destruction).[[47]](#footnote-48) Scripture incorporates this rudimentary good, but reveals its superiority over natural law by adding a host of higher goods to its roster of obligations.

Stephen Marshall, an influential and powerful preacher who sided with parliament during the wars, follows a similar tune. He presents natural law as an imperfect and inferior moral standard relative to Scripture, claiming that Scripture “super-adds” loftier moral laws to natural law. But he also defends the rudimentary elements of natural law and states that natural law commands men to “defend themselves against unjust violence.”[[48]](#footnote-49) Saltmarsh follows the same approach. He agrees that Christians should live by a higher standard than nature, but he does not deny that nature is a moral standard, in part because it is incorporated into Scripture. Also, like Rutherford and Marshall, Saltmarsh aligns natural law with the basic good of self-preservation: “Though grace destroys not nature, yet it perfects and glorifies nature, and it leads it out into higher and more excellent attainments. . . . Nature lives by this law, preserve thyself . . . and . . . Grace . . . deny thy self.”[[49]](#footnote-50)

A second way Englishmen debased natural law was by emphasizing its proscriptive rather than prescriptive character.[[50]](#footnote-51) For example, Reading wrote that natural law served rather “to check their failings . . . then to enform them.”[[51]](#footnote-52) For Reading, natural law was imperfect because it only issued prohibitions. Scripture was more complete because it instructed and informed men. Puritan divine Thomas Taylor, who railed against Catholics, wrote much the same thing: the sum of “natural law among the heathens . . . is, that what we would *not* another should do to us, we should *not* do to the other.”[[52]](#footnote-53) The Biblical form of the golden rule, by contrast, was less rudimentary. It was prescriptive and more robust. It told men to do unto another as they would be done unto. Likewise, discussing passages from Cicero about the vile heathen Tarquinius Superbus, Thomas Beard presents the proscriptive character of natural law. He claimed that even Tarquinius, who grasped natural law, “knoweth thus much, that he ought not to do that to another, which he would not another would do to him: which sentence the Emperor Serverus made always to be spoken aloud. . . . This is that equity and guidance . . . whereof nature her self is the schoolmistress.” Beard contrasts this negative natural morality with the morality available to men who have access to Scripture. The latter also know what “service, honor and glory . . . is due unto himself [God], and [they know] the mutual [positive] duty, [of] friendship and goodwill, which men owe to another.” [[53]](#footnote-54) In sum, to protect the supremacy of Scripture Englishmen demeaned the content of natural law, reduced its scope, and diminished the duties it entailed.

**The Obligatory Character of Natural Law**

What about the obligatory character of natural law? Following Paul, many Englishmen maintained that some actions performed by natural men revealed the *effects* of the natural law working within. But did natural men perform their good works (effects) from duty to God? Christians who learned the natural law by reading Scripture could construe natural law as a positive commandment from God (because Scripture incorporated natural law) and they could construe the law as obligatory on account of His positive command. Assuming they were saved, they could perform perfect acts of sanctity in service to His declared will. But why were natural men who had never received God’s positive commandments obeying natural law? Were they obeying it in service or from obligation to the true Christian God?

In answering these questions, one line of reasoning began from those natural precepts that God had implanted in man’s reason or in his conscience. It was claimed that obedience to these precepts was obligatory because, as Paul asserted, God was their author, and men were obligated to obey the author of their nature. The Pauline framework enabled Burgess, who addressed the question of “*The obligation of it, when the law of Nature doth bind”*  to reject the claim that natural precepts found in “man’s reason or conscience” bind all by themselves. The faculty of reason or conscience may issue a dictate, but men are not obligated to obey nature or their reason or their conscience. Natural law must bind “from God the authour.”[[54]](#footnote-55) That is, the principles in reason or in conscience bind because they “God implanted [them] in [the] soul.”[[55]](#footnote-56) David Primerose also used the Pauline framework of God as the author of nature to forge the connection between the rational precepts God implanted in the mind and moral obligation:

For we see that all the *Gentiles* by the light of nature . . . have some knowledge of . . . moral precepts. . . . Therefore the Apostle speaking of Infidels in his Epistle to the Romans . . . saith, *That they do by nature the things contained in the Law; shew the worke of the Law written in their hearts, and are a Law unto themselves*. If they have sinned against these points . . . they have . . . fought against their own knowledge . . . which God had imprinted in their minds, and whereof they were not ignorant [and thus bound and not excused on judgment day]. (Rom. 1:18)[[56]](#footnote-57)

For Primerose, natural man is not “a law unto himself” if that means he constructs his own laws and binds himself to obey or not obey them at will. Instead, Primerose claims natural man is bound to follow his “own knowledge” because God is the author of that knowledge. Ignorance of the moral law is no excuse on judgment day. Like Primerose, Robert Sanderson, the Bishop of Lincoln, ties the obligation to be rational to God as author of rationality through the writings of Paul. Sanderson wrote: “That imperium rationis, that power of natural conscience and reason . . . exerciseth [its power] over the whole man: doing the office of a law-giver. . . . They [the Gentiles] are a law unto themselves, saith the Apostle. . . . As a law [unto themselves], it [reason] prescribeth, what is to be done, as a Law, it commandeth, that what is prescribed be done.”[[57]](#footnote-58)

According to Sanderson, reason issues laws and these laws speak in the language of command. But these laws are obligatory because, as Paul said, God implanted reason into man. Rutherford makes the same argument about the obligatory nature of man’s moral *inclinations.* These inclinations take the form of a command and they command men to perform certain “factum (common practices).” Rutherford then maintains that it is obligatory for men to heed these commanding moral inclinations because “God in the law of nature . . . doth so warrant.”[[58]](#footnote-59)

But natural man does not know the true Christian God; he is unaware of His warrants. Nor does he know that he is obligated to obey the true God. Thus, natural man cannot act from duty in service to God. Rutherford concluded that the good actions natural men perform are imperfect because they are not caused by a sense of moral obligation (what he calls “jus”). They are motivated by commanding “carnal will and lusts . . . not because God in the law of nature . . . doth so warrant.” Rutherford states that good actions performed by natural men are imperfectly motivated: “Though materially [in effect] . . . the action be good . . . yet because they do them without any the least habitual reference to God . . . they are in the manner of doing, sinful.”[[59]](#footnote-60)

Likewise, Burgess, who focused on those who performed good works because reason or conscience commanded them to do so, wrote, “Every action ought to have a supernaturall end, viz. the glory of God, which they [natural men] did not aime at. . . . They [natural men] may do that good matter of the law, though not well.” “They may doe the substance of the worke, but not the manner of a good worke.”[[60]](#footnote-61) Only a Christian who did good works in service to the true God could perform a truly good work. A natural man could not meet this standard. For natural man, ought could not imply can because natural man had no (or virtually no) way of knowing the true Christian God: natural man had no way of knowing that he had a duty to God. Consequently, he could not act from duty even though he could do good acts. He was obligated to act from duty but he could not act from the duty.

These imperfect and tragic relationships between natural man, natural law and duty were not surprising to English Reformers. The very point of their accounts of these relationships was to reveal their imperfections. The point was to show that natural man and natural faculties were imperfect and weak and that natural law was an imperfect and weak standard for man. A discussion of these imperfections illuminated the need for a new relationship between man and God, a relationship forged at first through Moses and his positive law. Later down the historical road a second relationship was forged through Christ, and the Gospels. It was rooted upon the foundation of faith and grace.

1. **Summary of Natural Law in Context**

Before moving to Hobbes, let me summarize some of claims I have unearthed after examining natural law in context. First, there were Christians living in England who argued that natural man lacked natural morality. God left natural man to himself to act and live on the basis of interest and inclination. Because God gave this man no law, he committed no transgression, and thus he did not sin. Natural justice did not exist. If invincible ignorance of morality was an excuse, then God saved all natural men. If ignorance was no excuse, He damned them for doing what they could not help but do. Alternatively, He may have damned and saved them according to His arbitrary will, or He may have damned them all on account of original sin. Whatever the case, the amoral condition was an imperfect condition because it lacked morality. Amoral accounts of the state of nature and natural man pointed to the need to posit morality through positive law. This is what Moses did.

More often, however, English Christians maintained that natural morality did exist in the natural state. But because the Judeao-Christian God was the true and only God and natural man did not know the Judaeo-Christian God, natural morality was the morality for Godless men who amounted to atheists, or for men who worshipped false gods, or idols of their own making. It was the morality for those who lived before Scripture, or in regions without knowledge of Scripture. Or it was the morality for those who hypothesized themselves as non-Christians (i.e. as reprobates, apostates, atheists, or heathens). Moreover, because Scripture supplemented natural morality, the latter was an inferior morality. Its content was base and worldly. It made no reference to spiritual life or to Christian conceptions of salvation and eternity. In theory, Scripture somehow incorporated and added to natural law. In practice, it replaced it.

With respect to its form, natural morality was not formulated as positive law. Nor did it reflect God’s positive will. God as author wrote natural morality into man’s natural faculties. He placed moral principles into natural man’s mind or into his conscience. He also placed moral inclinations into his will. These principles and inclinations worked together and took the form of command. Some natural men acted upon these natural commands. They showed the effects of natural law working on the heart. But natural men did not heed these natural commands out of a sense of duty to the true God because natural men did not know the true God. As a result, they did good works, but not because of an obligation to God. They did good works because reason and passion compelled them somehow, but how?

If God judged men by their works (as many Catholics believed), then perhaps some natural men would be saved because they had moral knowledge, moral judgment, and a moral will. But for many Reformed Christians, doing a good work out of service to nature or reason or passion was akin to idolatry. It was sin. Good works required good intentions, and good intentions required knowledge of the true God gleamed from Scripture and natural man lacked this knowledge. So natural man was obligated to obey natural law, and in many instances he did obey natural law (he performed good works), but he could not obey natural law from duty to God. There was no uniform interpretation of how God judged these naturally motivated, godless natural men.

In their writings English clerics purposefully construed natural morality as imperfectly motivated. They also consciously emphasized its imperfect (because selfish and worldly) orientation. Moreover, they deliberately revealed its imperfect form. They also knowingly illuminated natural law’s poverty by discussing its rudimentary and proscriptive character. Finally, they intentionally associated natural law with godless and base human beings. English clerics wrote about natural law in this manner because they needed to explain the need for Scripture. They demeaned and debased natural law in order to explain how the positive laws of Scripture perfected the imperfect natural law.

**Hobbesian Natural Law in Context**

The Pauline framework shaped how many mid-seventeenth–century English clerics depicted natural man, the natural state, and natural law. Below, I argue that the framework informed the way Hobbes constructed his particular conception of natural law. I believe there is much to be gained by placing his account of natural law in this context and by assuming that Hobbes’s intended audience included Englishmen who were working within it. But before I turn specifically to natural law let me briefly suggest how the framework informed the choice of material from which Hobbes constructed the natural state, as well as his conception of natural man’s relationship to God.

As I have shown, Paul’s letters led English clerics to construct an account of natural man out of material written prior to the arrival of Scripture. This material included humanist texts written by pagan authors. It also included material from travel books containing empirical data about indigenous peoples living in regions that had not received the Word. Finally, it led men like Lord Digby to imagine themselves as non-Christians (i.e., reprobates, apostates, even heathens). From this hypothetical starting point, men attempted to articulate what human relations and morality would look like given a hypothetical condition where the Christian God as a common authority was absent. As scholars have shown, Hobbes drew from these past, present and hypothetical sources when constructing his account of natural man in *Leviathan.[[61]](#footnote-62)* Given the Pauline framework, the sources Hobbes draws from to depict natural man in the natural condition are not surprising and there is no reason to give priority to one source over another. All of these sources would have been perfectly acceptable for Englishmen working within the Pauline framework who aimed to reconstruct an account of natural man in the natural condition.

The Pauline framework also supported two prominent English interpretations of natural man’s relationship to God. The first rendered natural man a stranger to the true Christian God. Natural man was an atheist, or a polytheist or an idolater who worshipped gods of his own making. When describing natural religion in Part I of *Leviathan* Hobbes echoes this construal of natural man’s relationship to God. Natural men are strangers to Him because they are polytheists who fear “the power of Spirit**s** Invisible” (i.e., they do not fear a single Spirit). [[62]](#footnote-63) They worship “Gods,” rather than “God.”[[63]](#footnote-64) The Hobbesian natural condition not only lacks a common civil power. It also lacks a common spiritual power. According to Hobbes, each natural man fears “his own Religion” and swears oaths to his own private god. [[64]](#footnote-65) Each also worships the god or gods of his own, private making. In short, Hobbes’s natural man does not worship the God that English Christians working within the Pauline framework would consider the true and only God. His account fits within the Pauline framework because it depicts natural man as Godless.

The second English interpretation of Paul’s account of natural man’s relationship to God asserted that natural man could arrive at a very crude kind of monotheism. God in this analysis was the cause of nature. When Hobbes accounts for monotheism in the natural state, he follows this second English interpretation of Paul. He claims that natural knowledge of God is available to men who trace the cause of “natural bodies” to their very beginning. These men “at last come to this, that there must be (as even the Heathen Philosopher confessed) one First Mover.” This conception of God vests God with authority on account of His power.[[65]](#footnote-66) But natural men who grasp this God as “a First, and Eternal cause of all things,” do not have a spiritual grasp of Him; they are “without thought” of heaven and hell.[[66]](#footnote-67) This is because natural theology is devoid of spiritual content. If natural men define God as “Spirit Incorporeall,” they “confess their definition to be unintelligible.” Echoing his Reformed contemporaries, Hobbes argues that natural faculties like reason and instinct cannot go beyond the realm of nature; they cannot reach over into the realm of spirit.[[67]](#footnote-68) Natural man is a corporeal being with a corporeal soul. Only supernatural faculties like faith cross over and beyond.[[68]](#footnote-69) Hobbes’s conception of the God of nature fits within the Pauline framework because it is a materialist conception of God scrubbed of any spiritual characteristics.[[69]](#footnote-70)

English clerics who posited that morality existed in the natural condition interpreted passages from Paul to mean that natural morality did not take the form of law if by law men meant God’s positive will. They maintained that God did not positively declare natural morality; he authored it and “wrote” it into man’s heart. Hobbes echoes this English account of the form of natural law. First, he acknowledges that in many circles natural law is called “law.” However, paralleling his contemporaries, Hobbes claims that until natural morality is “delivered in the word of God” (i.e. positively declared by God through words or in the Word) natural morality is not, properly speaking, law.[[70]](#footnote-71) Actual or hypothetical natural men who have not heard God’s Word on account of their temporal or geographical location do not possess a moral law (properly speaking). Hobbes’s account of natural law fits squarely within the Pauline framework because Hobbes claims natural law *is not law* “properly speaking.”[[71]](#footnote-72)

To say that natural morality does not take the form of law in the natural state should not stop us from considering whether or not natural morality takes some other form in Hobbes’s account of the state of nature. Some radical English sects claimed that the natural state was altogether devoid of morality. In their account of the state of nature, there was no transgression because there was no law and thus no sin. Less radical Calvinist-leaning English clerics maintained that man’s corruption left him altogether unable to know or do good. Natural man was riddled with sin and thus desperately in need of Christ. More Arminian-leaning English clerics presented a more charitable depiction of man’s nature. They stated that natural law, although inferior in content and strength when compared to Scripture, revealed itself as a set of rudimentary but weak moral principles located in reason or conscience; and as a bundle of moral inclinations or instincts located in the will. Natural men could access these principles and inclinations and perhaps even act upon them, although their access and action was imperfect compared to Scripture. When describing man’s natural moral orientation, these Englishmen highlighted the worldly orientation of this morality. It advanced self-preservation, for example. They also used reason, conscience, inclination, and will interchangeably when describing the self-interested morality they ascribed to natural man.

In Part I of *Leviathan*, Hobbes acknowledges the ill condition of natural man, but like many of his religious contemporaries, Hobbes does not leave natural man utterly devoid of natural morality. The state of nature is a state of war: solitary, rude, nasty, brutish and short. But in this natural state where scarcity abounds Hobbes offers an account of morality and he says men are obligated to endeavor to follow it. His account aligns with the Pauline natural law framework because his account of natural morality is rudimentary. It aligns with the way clerics in England described natural morality because it is a carnal morality that is preservation-focused, and more proscriptive than prescriptive.

Like his contemporaries, Hobbes locates natural morality “partly in the passions, partly in….reason.” [[72]](#footnote-73) In some sections of *Leviathan* Hobbes identifies morality as a shared set of principles, precepts, or thereoms located in reason or in conscience. These are accessible to man, assuming he crafts definitions properly and reasons rightly (i.e., the way Hobbes reasons). Deductions can be made from these first principles; and further principles can be deduced through proper syllogizing.[[73]](#footnote-74) In other sections of *Leviathan* Hobbes identifies morality with a shared set of passions or preferences. He concedes that different individuals have different passions and preferences on account of their different natural physiology, education and cultural upbringing.[[74]](#footnote-75) They have different and even competing conceptions of good and bad. However, Hobbes also claims that men share a certain aversion for violent death and consequently they collectively identify violent death as bad. They also share a certain appetite for peaceful, commodious living and they collectively identify peace and comfort as good.[[75]](#footnote-76) That is, humans share a common morality that originates in passions they share. To advance these goods, instrumental reason constructs prudential rules. These rules are the so-called laws of nature. They express the general ways for mankind to avoid death and to satisfy the passion for peaceful, commodious living.[[76]](#footnote-77)

At no point does Hobbes decide explicitly between these different articulations of morality’s natural form. As I have argued, the distinction between natural reason and natural inclination was not of crucial significance to Reformation Englishmen working within the Pauline framework who preferred to emphasize the distinction between nature and spirit in their discussions of natural law. Both reason and inclination belonged to the natural realm. Both provided natural man with a morality that was oriented toward the things of this world. If we assume, as I suggest we do, that Hobbes was either writing from within the Pauline framework, or that Englishmen who interpreted natural law from within this framework were his intended audience, we need not decide which particular form of natural morality is Hobbes’s true teaching (and which is not). Both are part of Hobbes’s teaching in *Leviathan.[[77]](#footnote-78)* Both are natural faculties. Neither contains spiritual content. Both orient men away from the natural condition toward the authorization of an absolute civil sovereign akin to Moses who incorporates, adds to and perhaps even replaces natural morality by issuing positive moral laws.

English clerics working within the Pauline framework not only discussed the form natural morality took. They also discussed the obligatory nature of this morality. Hobbes’s account of “natural obligation” in *Leviathan* parallels their account. [[78]](#footnote-79) The ground of moral obligation is not divine command. Hobbes, following the Pauline framework, claimed that God did not issue positive commands in the natural state. Moreover, natural obligation does not stem solely from God’s creativity. As First Cause, God created and determined everything good as well as everything evil. By itself, His creativity itself does not help us understand the ground of moral obligation.

Using the Pauline framework, English clerics claimed man’s natural obligations

originated from God as *author* of nature. In *Leviathan,* Hobbes develops this Pauline interpretation. He asserts God is an author in the sense of an authority: He has authority over nature on account of His omnipotence.[[79]](#footnote-80) Second, He is an author in the sense of a creator. He is the first cause and thus the author of everything, including morality. Third, as an author He has the power to invest His authority into whatever He creates. He can give authority to parts of man’s nature; and He can withhold authority from other parts of man’s nature. [[80]](#footnote-81) Natural morality is therefore obligatory because God authored and authorized natural morality. He wrote morality into certain faculties within the heart. Hobbes in *Leviathan* searches hearts; he seeks to read and decipher the morality of “Man-Kind” from the “legible” “characters of mans heart, blotted and confounded as they are.” [[81]](#footnote-82) Presumably, natural morality is “blotted and confounded” (i.e. nearly impossible to discern, thus opening the door to moral skepticism and creating the need to perfect natural morality through positive law) on account of the ill condition natural men find themselves in on account of Adam’s fall.

English clerics who articulated an account of natural morality and obligation claimed that natural men sometimes performed good works and thereby revealed the effects of the law written in their hearts. However, these men did not perform good works from duty to God because they did not know that the true God was the author of the principles and the inclinations motivating them. Hobbes’s discussion of natural men follows this Pauline pattern. He concedes that natural men are subject to or determined by God in the same way “Beasts, and Plants, and Bodies inanimate” are. Like these beings, God has power over natural men. However, Hobbes is quite clear that men who are in the kingdom of God by nature “understand no Precepts” as God’s commands. He likens these men to “Atheists…because they acknowledge no Word for his.” Hobbes even says these men “are to be understood as [the] Enemies” of God who might treat them with “hostility.” [[82]](#footnote-83)

The latter treatment is not punishment because natural men do not know that they violate God’s precepts. Hobbes asserts that God might excuse these men as their failure to act from duty to God comes from “ignorance,” and ignorance opens the door to “excuse.”[[83]](#footnote-84) But Hobbes waivers on this point. Ignorance of God is one thing. Ignorance of natural morality is another and all men who possess the capacity to reason have access to natural morality, although they might not know they are obligated to obey certain commands issued by reason or passion.[[84]](#footnote-85) In any case, Hobbes concludes that God’s “Right of Afflicting” men “is not always derived from mens Sinne, but from Gods power.” Therefore, God might shower afflictions upon natural men who do good works or He might shower affliction upon Christians who act from duty on account of His “Right of afflicting men at [H]is pleasure.”[[85]](#footnote-86) Hobbes’s God has the right to act arbitrarily.

Why do natural men who “understand no Precepts” as originating from God perform good works, according to Hobbes? What motivates them to reveal the effects of natural law written in their hearts? English clerics maintained that self-interest and lust motivated some natural men to perform good deeds. Hobbes’s account in *Leviathan* does not deviate from this Reformed interpretation of Paul. Sometimes Hobbes mixes factual and normative claims when explaining why natural men follow natural law. He comes up asserting that natural men are compelled by necessity to endeavor (to choose? to will?) to act morally. He writes, “Every man, not only by Right, but also *by necessity of Nature*, is supposed to endeavor all he can, to obtain that which is necessary for his conservation.”[[86]](#footnote-87) He also states, “No man *can* transferre, or lay down his Right to save himself from Death, Wounds, and Imprisonment…For man by nature [necessarily] chooseth the lesser evil, which is the danger of death in resisting; rather than the greater, which is certain and present death in not resisting.” [[87]](#footnote-88) To claim that natural men are compelled or necessitated by nature to do or to endeavor to do good works fits within the Pauline framework because the claim disassociates the good works natural men do from religious duty.[[88]](#footnote-89) In the Pauline framework, natural men do not perform religious duties to the true God, and Hobbes’s account squares with this view.

Reason and passion speak in the language of command, according to Hobbes. Their commanding language urges natural men to perform (or endeavor to perform) good works. Reason issues “dictates,”[[89]](#footnote-90) and “the language of Desire, and Aversion, is Imperative; as Do this, forbeare that.”[[90]](#footnote-91) However, natural men are not aware that God is the author of these imperatives. Natural man (or most natural men if we exclude folks like Abraham and Noah) lacks knowledge of the God who issues these authoritative commands. Therefore, the commands issued by reason or passion amount to counsel. Natural men heed the counsels of reason and passion because they advance their good. Hobbes’s account of why natural men do good works squares with the Pauline framework because it explains why natural men obey natural morality without invoking religious duty. His account squares with the Pauline framework because it does not invoke anything spiritual. The reason why natural men do good is because doing good advances their interests and passions.

**Conclusion**

So far I have tied Hobbes’s account of natural law to accounts offered by English clerics who aligned their reading of Paul with their belief in the existence of natural morality. However, in my discussion of the Pauline framework, I unearthed a second, more radical reading of Paul. According to it, natural morality was no morality at all. Morality did not exist in the natural state. Natural men were left to live their lives as they wished. Every man was a law unto himself.

In *Leviathan* Hobbes develops this radical amoral interpretation of the state of nature alongside his more conservative interpretation. Along radical lines, he asserts, “The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice have there [in the state of nature] no place.” Echoing passages from Paul, Hobbes claims that the natural condition is a condition without law and “where no Law, no injustice.”[[91]](#footnote-92) He suggests that God did not write morality into man’s heart: “Justice and injustice are none of the Faculties neither of the Body, nor Mind.” [[92]](#footnote-93) He also writes, “the Desire and other Passions of man, are in themselves no Sin. No more are the Actions, that proceed from those Passions, till they know a Law that forbids them; which till Law be made [by the civil sovereign] they cannot know.[[93]](#footnote-94)

Hobbes even offers explanations that help support the amoral conception of the natural state. If natural morality originates from the passions, then an intersubjective morality does not exist because man’s passions are inherently partial and subjective.[[94]](#footnote-95) If natural morality originates in reason, then an intersubjective natural morality does not exist because reason itself is inherently partial and subjective.[[95]](#footnote-96) If natural morality originates in conscience, then an intesubjective morality does not exist because conscience is inherently partial and subjective.[[96]](#footnote-97)

From a philosophical point of view, to assert that the natural condition contains and did not contain morality is a contradiction. Hobbes sometimes resolves the contradiction in favor of natural morality by invoking conservative platitudes. For example, he enlists the notions of intellectual expertise, insisting that only the trained, impartial few know how to construct definitions properly and how to syllogize rightly. [[97]](#footnote-98) Radical sectaries who advanced the amoral reading of the natural state were not these intellectual elites. They began with false premises; they made erroneous inferences. Or, they were too partial, too vain, too hasty, too distracted, too stupid, too lazy, or too sloppy and undisciplined to reason rightly. They also lacked the time to think, as they were forced by circumstance to spend their days procuring the mere necessities of life.[[98]](#footnote-99)

Hobbes also appears to resolve the contradiction in favor of natural morality by considering what consequences follow if we assume natural amorality. Hobbes writes, “[Those who] have thereupon take for principles, and grounds of their Reasoning, that justice is but a vain word: that whatsoever a man can get by his own industry and hazard is his own…lead human life back to bestiality and mutual slaughter. Of those who think like this, who will abstain from any crime, no matter how great?” [[99]](#footnote-100) Even with a powerful civil sovereign, trust and peace are likely to disintegrate if men presume that there is no rational principle or moral instinct compelling them to endeavor to preserve themselves by keeping faith. Life, peace and prosperity are more likely follow if we assume the existence of natural morality. On consequentialist grounds, Hobbes opts for natural morality over natural amorality.

 From a rhetorical and political perspective, Hobbes uses the moral and the amoral conception of the state of nature to his advantage. Both conceptions reveal the imperfections plaguing the natural state. Radical English clerics who assumed that the state of nature is amoral are led by Hobbes to recognize the need to establish a civil authority,. The civil sovereign they authorize perfects the natural state by issuing and enforcing positive moral laws; the civil sovereign creates morality out of his own private will, and this is an improvement upon the natural condition. More conservative English readers who assume the state of nature contains a law of nature are led by Hobbes to understand why imperfect men cannot fulfill the fundamental moral law by themselves. A powerful civil sovereign must be authorized. Through the sovereign’s use of positive law and through the exertion of his will or his grace, natural law finally achieves fulfillment, or perfection.

For Reformation Englishmen reading *Leviathan* what is simply amazing about Hobbes’s account of natural law is that neither Moses’s positive laws, nor the positive laws written in the Gospels, nor the grace of Christ serve to perfect and fulfill (and in effect replace) natural law. The civil sovereign saves his faithful subjects. He fulfills natural law with the help of their faith in him. For those Englishmen working within the Pauline natural law framework, the novelty of Hobbes’s account of natural law rests on this wildly heretical assertion.
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