FEW title-page designs, if any, can rival the success of that bluntly eloquent engraving which prefaces the first edition (1651) of Thomas Hobbes’s *Leviathan* (fig. 1). Though it was re-used for two further editions in the author’s own lifetime, successive reproductions have given it far wider currency since its reappearance in the great Molesworth edition of Hobbes’s collected works of 1839–45.1 Today it is still quite commonly invoked in expositions of Hobbes’s thought: even if there have also been murmurs that it must take part of the blame at least, for certain persistent misunderstandings or oversimplifications of key elements in his theory. It is a remarkable record, and the plate has attracted scholarly attention and a certain amount of debate, not just as a trailer to *Leviathan* but also in its own right. In 1852, Whewell inadvertently launched the notion that the face of Leviathan was first so drawn as to resemble that of Charles I; and then, in the next two editions, altered to resemble Cromwell: a persistent myth, still amazingly accepted as fact even in a work published as late as 1971.3 Meanwhile the question of attribution has been sporadically canvassed; and for a while appeared to be closed. In 1898, F. A. Borovsky, in his supplement to Gustav Parthey’s descriptive catalogue of the works of Wenceslas Hollar, credited the *Leviathan* title-page engraving to this artist; and it is still mounted with the Hollar title-pages in the volumes devoted to Hollar’s work in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum. In A. F. Johnson’s *Catalogue of English Engraved and Etched Title-Pages* (Oxford, 1934) the engraver is recorded as unknown: Major H. Howard (whose own card-catalogue of Hollar’s work is now also in the British Museum) having satisfied Johnson that small details of the lettering were inconsistent with Hollar’s work. Without impugning either Borovsky or Howard, it may be added that other details too ought to have raised doubts about the Hollar attribution, particularly the architecture of some of the buildings depicted. Hollar was a man with an evident interest in buildings, who understood—and accurately observed—architecture. It is unlikely that such a man would plant a ridge-roof upon a fortification that is plainly of the Bastille type (small left-hand panel), and the crudity of some of the little churches depicted seems out of character too. The work is also a little unworthy of Hollar in other ways. Despite its proven effectiveness, and the very high degree of technical skill shown in the way in which a sharp separateness is given to the individual figures within the outline of the Mortal God, without losing a sense of weight and mass in the figure as a whole, there is a slight deadness about the
Fig. 1. T. Hobbes, Leviathan (London, 1651), title-page. 240 x 155 mm
design, as well as perhaps a slight old-fashionedness. In part, no doubt, this may be due to the artist fleshing-out someone else’s idea: originally planned perhaps in fairly precise detail by a man in his sixties whose younger years had coincided with the heyday of the Emblem Book in England, and who had never shown any special practical talent for the visual arts. For in fact no one but Hobbes himself is likely to have been familiar enough with his vast manuscript, prior to publication, to have dared to reduce the nub of its argument to this confident emblem; and both its slightly bullying didacticism and its imaginative quality seem to have very much the stamp of his mind: a purely verbal image such as his splendid Gothic figure of the Papacy as the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire ‘sitting crowned upon the grave thereof’, has obvious kinship with the picture of the great Leviathan, towering up over its engraved landscape. The fact that Hobbes also prefixed a drawn version of the same emblem to the handsome manuscript copy of *Leviathan* which he gave to Charles II (now in the British Library, fig. 2) is surely another pointer to the degree of his own engagement in the design.

None the less, the slight ‘deadness’ of the printed title-page, referred to above, so uncharacteristic of Hollar, cannot simply be referred back to the original conception of the design; it is there in the execution of the engraving. Moreover, ‘deadness’ is not in this case a merely subjective term of abuse: it is an objectively demonstrable characteristic of the engraving—a kind of slackness of thought, or failure of attention—which shows up clearly when comparison is made with the drawn version presented to Charles. The most important difference between the two versions, as far as their relation to Hobbes’s system of ideas is concerned, is of course in the composition of Leviathan’s body. I will discuss below the separate issues this raises. The differences in relatively small details of execution are of special interest in the present case. Take, for example, the uppermost pair of the two columns of small panels. In the drawing, the ridge-roof the engraver planted on the Bastille-like castle turns into two gables, at right angles to each other, of a separate building within the circuit of the curtain-wall; and the castle is crowned, not just by a domestic chimney-stack but by some sort of turret or watch-tower: a logical culmination to the placing of the castle itself upon a height, emphasizing the idea of overriding control. The gateway of the engraver’s castle is almost cyclopean, yet refuses to look us squarely in the eye, and no very obvious roadway leads away from it towards us. Here again the drawing is superior. It is remarkable how much is lost too, in a minor way, by the engraver shifting the rooftop figure of Christ away from the arched western pediment of the drawn church (for which he substitutes a lumpy gable), thus destroying a neat sculptural echo of the common presentation in church art of both Christ and the Almighty standing or seated enthroned above the cosmic arch: an echo which makes a transitional link to the superior figure of Leviathan in the panel above, rising over the arched landscape in a manner reminiscent of precisely the same tradition of Christian iconography. The engraver’s handling of the main upper panel is no better. The layout of his little town is much less well integrated with its citadel, and gives the impression of houses jammed down to fill empty spaces at points where the drawn version has a much more definite sense of a street plan. The drawing avoids also the military oddity of letting a tall house almost lean into the main gateway
Fig. 2. T. Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651), drawn title-page. Eg.1910. 248 × 173 mm
of the fortifications. Worse, however, is the deadening of verticals and lines of perspective in the panel as a whole. This does not merely weaken the focus of the whole image upon the figure of Leviathan: it also results in an image which less well expresses the general sense of the book. In the engraving, apart from the sprinkling of tin-tacks which make Leviathan afraid to rest his elbows on the far horizon, and the uncomfortable line of spiky spires aimed just outside his right armpit, the overwhelming upthrust comes from the large twin-towered church. In the drawing, the upthrust of the big church is echoed by a scattering of very prominent trees and some particularly sharply pointed tower roofs on the right of the church itself, all of which disappear in the engraved version. The resultant loss is not simply aesthetic: an emblem prefacing a highly rationalistic, anti-ecclesiastical work has been simplified into a picture in which it is only the church which points with any force to higher things, rather than a whole world directing our attention upwards, or rather, Leviathan-wards, while in the drawing there is a great deal that serves to take us into the picture, towards the heart as it were of Leviathan; all of which is absent in the engraved plate. It is worth giving attention to such details, for it will be seen that they may prove a larger point than the one which I set out to make.

Howard showed forty years ago that details of the lettering of the engraved title-page were unlike Hollar’s work. The above comparisons show a slackness of attention, failure of intelligence, insensitivity to architecture, and indifference to possibilities of perspective, all of which seem equally un-Hollar-like. Exultant mastery of perspective depth in particular is a marked Hollar attribute. But the absence of such virtues in the engraving is demonstrated by contrast with their presence in the drawing, which shows other characteristic attributes of Hollar’s style. The peculiarly ‘soft’ quality of the drawing, especially noticeable in the representation of Leviathan’s face, is almost a Hollar trade-mark in itself, for instance, and his slight clumsiness with the human figure might be thought to be reflected in Leviathan’s somewhat nerveless wrists. A stronger indication, however, is to be found in the treatment of Leviathan’s eyes: this can be matched elsewhere in Hollar’s work. Moreover, the original attribution of the engraving to Hollar was not simply absurd: one has only to look at a print such as his Einnahme der Stadt Oppenheim durch die Schweden to see its point; and all such pointers of course apply a fortiori to the drawing. This is suggestive enough in itself. But the suggestion becomes positively insistent when two further points are taken into account. In the first place, the implication of the comparisons made above is clearly that the drawing is antecedent to the engraving. It is not necessarily the drawing from which the engraved title-page was taken; but at the very least it represents a second copy or alternative state of the original design, by the hand of the same artist. The way in which it repeatedly gives a clearer expression, even in quite small details, to points blurred by the engraver puts this beyond serious doubt. Secondly, Howard’s grounds for denying the attribution of the engraving to Hollar do not seem to apply to the drawn version. On this point it is impossible to speak absolutely categorically, since the details of Howard’s case do not seem to have been recorded; but it seems obvious that he must have been thinking particularly of the inscription ‘Non est potestas’ which heads the engraved page, where both the slope of the lettering and the form of the letter p
do not look like Hollar’s work, despite the immense variety of his lettering styles. Significantly, this inscription does not appear in the drawing, where there are also various small differences in the style of the lettering of the title-panel. It appears to be possible to match all the little divergences in lettering style in the drawn version of the title-panel elsewhere in Hollar’s work, and the general style of the title-panel lettering in both versions is certainly one he used. The conclusion seems inescapable: Wenzel Hollar is the artist of the drawn title-page presented to Charles II, and the engraved title-page was made in England from a Hollar drawing sent over by Hobbes along with his manuscript. The cutting of the engraving in England seems implied by its omission of the big sharply pointed trees in the large panel, and of the extremely tall spire-like roofs on the right-hand towers of the town fortifications, since both silhouettes were alien to the southern English landscape; while the engraving’s slightly reduced degree of effectiveness in expressing the sense of the book also might be thought to suggest a craftsman not in touch with either the original artist or the author.

The fact that he took the trouble to procure the presentation manuscript he gave to Charles II proves its importance to Hobbes. His full motives for the gift were clearly quite complex, but he knew in advance that the Royalists were unlikely to approve the book, and simple self-defence must have been one powerful factor. He needed to show that this was not a book that he felt ashamed of in Royalist company: that it was a work of science, presenting permanently valid principles, which only an accident of the times made apt to ‘frame the minds of a thousand gentlemen’ to conscientious obedience to Cromwell. In addition, the missionary urge natural to every political philosopher from Plato onwards must also have moved him as he presented the manuscript to Charles: the claims his book makes for itself are sufficient proof of that. It follows from this that Hobbes is unlikely to have been too casual about the presentation of his gift, of which the drawn title-page doubling the functions of today’s blurb and dust-jacket design, was the most important part. This in itself would be sufficient to explain his turning to Hollar: probably one of the greatest graphic artists whose name would have been familiar to Hobbes, and also Charles’s old tutor in drawing, whose style could be expected to suit the royal taste. In this connection it is of interest that for a period running at least from the execution of Charles I to his son’s defeat at Worcester, Hollar is thought to have been consciously courting the favour of the Prince. Although he had made his home in Holland during the Civil War years, it has been asserted that he joined the Royalists in the Channel Islands for a while around 1650, and the most recently published study of his work accepts that there are reasons for suspecting that when he later returned to England he did so as a clandestine Royalist courier. Hollar, in touch with Royalist circles, thus may have passed through France at a suitable time, and Hobbes could in any case have easily enough made contact with him even when in Holland, either by a personal visit or via intermediaries. For although Hobbes himself was living among the English exiles in Paris, his admirer Sorbière, for example, seems to have brought out editions of his master’s work indifferently in Holland or Paris as convenience served, and there was always ample communication between the English Royalists in both countries. In short, there seems to be no practical
obstacle to postulating that Hobbes was making use of Hollar’s services some time around 1650–1, and it appears that Hollar would have had reasons of his own for taking particular interest at that time in any commission destined for the young Charles II. He would also have been well placed, had Hobbes so wished, to borrow the features of the young Prince for his representation of the Mortal God: a point to which we must return.

This brings us back in a different way to the question of attribution. To what extent do we face here a work of Wenzel Hollar, and to what extent are we facing a work of Thomas Hobbes himself? To a puzzling degree, the general co-ordination of the details of the design can be read either in straightforward aesthetic terms, or else as a further embodiment of the ideas of the book. From the first point of view, it exhibits finesses unlikely to have been within Hobbes’s compass; from the second point of view it seems to exhibit a familiarity with Hobbes’s work that one might have thought would have been beyond Hollar. Which is the correct way to read it? If the answer is an Empsonian why not both? then what seems to be implied is a degree of collaboration between artist and author so close as to be of interest even on those grounds alone. A concrete example will make the point clearer. Take for instance the visual progression which links the two columns of small panels to the large panel above them. On the left it is simple enough. From the collisions of the battle scene we rise to the crowded trophy of weapons, in which the drum and flag (which unite many men and bring them into step) are most prominent and are placed between crossed muskets. The hint of the muskets is picked up in the next panel, in the image of the cannon (force directed to a single end), with the symbol of sovereignty aptly floating above it, which is then transformed into the crown of towers on their commanding high place. From the multiple disorder of the battlefield (for Hobbes the State of Nature is the state of war of all against all) we are thus led upwards through images of controlled force, authority, and command, in a sequence the natural culmination of which is the great crowned figure of Leviathan rising commandingly over its own hilltop: a reasonably uncomplicated transition, quite as likely to stem from Hollar as from Hobbes. Even so, some questions suggest themselves. One neat point about the drawing is the conspicuous inconspicuousness of the citadel of the little town, symmetrical with the big church, yet so flattened and unemphatic that it noticeably fails to provide a rung on the visual ladder we have been climbing towards Leviathan. In terms of Hobbes’s ideas in the book that is perfectly correct; to have given more prominence to the citadel would have been to commit a tautology, since what it stands for is better represented by the over-riding figure of the Mortal God. Yet is this a point that one would have expected Hollar to have taken unprompted? On the other hand, there is no sign that Hobbes possessed the talent or inclination for the purely visual game-with-a-hoop that goes on in the left-hand panels: taking a plain circle, making it into the rim of a drum, turning the drum into a cannon-wheel, then laying the circle flat, so that the heavily notched and ridged rim of the wheel becomes the cresting of a crown—this is the sport of a draughtsman, not of a philosopher. It is the same in the parallel column: a visual progression links the right-hand sequence of binary images via the emphasized division of the mitre, and the repeated double church towers to Leviathan’s twin weapons of sword and pastoral staff, thus
helping to tie the big panel in with the rest of the plate in a way which does not seem to have much to do with its ideas content. Within the smaller sequence itself, the draughtsman can again be seen playing his games. It is delightful to see how the Disputation can be read, in relation to the panel above it, as a trident—with the central body of Church opinion topped by the authority of the President—or as a fork; and delightful too to see how the trophy of theological weapons focuses upon the diagonally placed fork whose shape is picked up not only by the mitre but also by Leviathan’s sword and staff. Again one wonders whether this is all. Consider for instance the curious design of the two churches. The flanking of a church by high thin towers half way down its length is rare in European architecture, and is primarily associated with southern Germany, Bohemia, and Switzerland. This is an area in which Hollar had travelled and worked during an important phase in his career. So it is perhaps not surprising that the church in the small panel is very reminiscent of the Neupfarrkirche in Regensburg, where Hollar stayed in the train of the Earl of Arundel and where he received his Patent of Nobility from the Emperor; or that the general silhouette of the larger church should suggest that of Augsburg Cathedral as it appeared in Hollar’s day (except for the hanging pepperpot turrets on the tower tops, which are a characteristic feature of the Gothic of Hollar’s native Bohemia); or that we should find much the same arrangement of central twin towers and spires in a Hollar drawing of the Swiss convent of Einsiedeln.³ None the less, despite these reminiscences, the two structures Hollar presents to us do not seem to be quite like any actual building. Both are interesting in their cross-breeding of classical and Gothic forms and the smaller church particularly, is imaginative, original, and creative. But would it have been created purely for the sake of filling out a tidy visual pattern? Is it merely coincidental that Leviathan is an anti-ecclesiastical book, attacking Church authority as a divisive force, and offering a clear, simple, and conclusive new intellectual method to replace the unsatisfactory tools of traditional styles of theologico-philosophical discussion, which so often prove to strike equally well in opposite directions? The idea of a church spire as a finger pointing the way to God was not new in Hobbes’s day; and in his day too the Church was very markedly pointing the way to God with two rival, competitive fingers, Protestant and Catholic. In a highly number-conscious age, when even Hobbes himself thought it worth noting that his great work had been produced in the year of his Grand Climacteric,² is it possible that the twin spires of the church in the large panel, firmly placed where the expectation would be to find one single central spire, have a conscious significance? Considering the detailed reading which the Emblem books invite, it is not necessarily a sign of a too curious mind to consider this. Did Hobbes positively want a twin-spired church, or did Hollar just wish to avoid the weightiness of a large single tower that might detract visually from the predominance of the Mortal God? It is worth raising such considerations, however inconclusively, if only as a useful way of establishing the background against which the largest discrepancy between the drawn and the engraved versions has to be seen: the alteration of the face and of the composition of the body of the Mortal God. This is the only substantial change for which the will of the artist (or the author) rather than the ineptness of the engraver seems clearly to be responsible and Hollar might be thought to
be neatly combining, in the general strategy of the large panel, two traditions. The echoes of the frequent representations in religious art of Christ or the Almighty standing or seated enthroned above the Cosmic Arch (often holding sword and scales) are of course obvious, and were clearly recognized, since the rather crudely designed title-page of the French translation of the *Elements of Law* (1652) borrows the figure of Leviathan and re-equip him with the traditional sword and scales. This allusion is strengthened in the drawing by the curvature and the blurring of the landscape beyond the first skyline, which can be seen to be land but has almost the effect of an arch of cloud. On the other hand, there was also a tradition of depicting an earth-goddess, under various names, as springing up from a bulge of ground, sometimes with some appropriate symbol in each hand. Here too is an apposite parallel to the image of the Mortal and hence terrestrial God. Seen in this perspective, the superiority of the engraved body of Leviathan to the drawn version seems quite obvious. The drawn version seems unquestionably the better expression of Hobbes’s ideas, as most people would understand them today, since the outward-looking faces make the point, important to him, that what Leviathan wills is what we will. Unhappily the image that conveys this notion also tends to raise visual memories of depictions of that devil whose name is Legion. Therefore the neat wit by which the engraved design simply moves the adoringly contemplative host of the saved and blessed, familiar from the traditional paintings, into the silhouette of the Deity, seems preferable even while being less Hobbesian, and giving some encouragement to misunderstandings. If the presentation drawing does represent the earlier state of the design, then this appears to be an interesting instance of the draughtsman overruling the philosopher. By contrast, the alteration of the face of Leviathan seems to have no particular aesthetic significance, but may well have significance of another sort. There has been a myth among writers on Hobbes that the first version of the engraved title-page of *Leviathan* showed the features of Charles I, which was then changed to a portrait of Cromwell in the alleged second and third editions of the work. In fact this is untrue, for it has now been shown that the ‘Charles I’ edition is the real third edition (issued c. 1680), for which the same plate was used as for the two genuine editions of 1651, and consequently it carries the wrong date. But the plate was too worn to be used without retouching, and the retouching produced changes in Leviathan’s face, thus giving rise to the myth. None the less, the fact remains that it seems always to have been accepted that the face of Leviathan in the two genuine editions of 1651, though too hairy to be a precise photographic likeness, is unmistakably suggestive of the features of Oliver Cromwell. Some have seen this as an attempt at self-protection by Hobbes’s London publisher, others have seen it as a piece of prudence, cowardice, or sycophancy by Hobbes himself at a time when, like Hollar, ‘the truth was he had a mind to go home’. Others again have seen it as an act of simple common sense: Hobbes, a political philosopher seeking practical results by enunciating universal truths, was not necessarily either a coward or a renegade because he could see that Cromwell came closer than any other Englishman in 1651 to embodying the figure of Leviathan. In this connection it is therefore interesting that the face on the drawn title-page, again if one reduces its luxuriance of facial hair, is in fact strongly suggestive, not of Cromwell
A LETTER,
Containing a most briefe Discourse Apologeticall, with a plaine Demonstration, and seruent Protestation, for the lawfull, sincere, very faithfull and Christian course, of the Philosophical studies and exercises, of a certaine studious Gentleman: An ancient Servaunt to her most excellent Maiestie Royall.

Psalm 108. 5
Ego autem Orabam, Psalm. 108.
Qui le sait? Brehissa
Le loup le mange.


Fig. 3. J. Dee, A Letter (London, 1599). 1608/657. 190 × 137 mm
nor even Charles I (for a beheaded Leviathan is a contradiction in terms) but of Charles II himself. As a child, the younger Charles seems to have been extremely good-looking, in a rather pudgy-faced juvenile way. Then, in his later teens and early twenties, his beak of a nose began to push its way up through his softly rounded youthful features. The process can be enjoyably followed through successive portrayals of Charles at various ages; but in this case we need only turn to Hollar's own acknowledged engraving of Charles, dating from 1650 (fig. 4), in which appear the same pouchied eyes as in the drawing—unusual in so young a man—and the same rather heavy strong nose, in an otherwise somewhat suety face, marked by thick eyebrows, which arch more than in the 'Cromwell' face. In both versions of the title-page the only real difference between the face depicted (which had to be generalized a little for iconic purposes) and that of the person alluded to, lies in the addition of a beard too small to conceal the features being portrayed, and a fuller moustache. If this has never stopped the face on the engraved title from being seen as that of Cromwell, then the face on the drawn title can be seen as Charles II. It may be said that this is no more than might be expected. All the same it does throw a useful sidelong on Hobbes's state of mind at this time. It is true that the Charles who received Hobbes's presentation was the apparently ruined refugee from the Battle of Worcester, but the manuscript must already have been in preparation before that catastrophe, when Charles looked a much larger political figure; and even after the battle the impressive fact remained that Charles had been crowned King of Scots. That both potential leaders of Great Britain should thus have been enabled to see their own image in that of Leviathan, certainly helps to dispose of any notion that the London publication of Hobbes's great work, with its engraved title, was a mere piece of fawning by a tired, frightened, and elderly fugitive. The author of Leviathan was a man exasperated and distressed by the splintering fabric of the state to which he belonged, who believed he knew the answer to his country's problems. To ensure that both men who might assume the mantle of Leviathan should understand their role, he was prepared to present it to them by visual as well as verbal hints, and he employed the services of the best artist he knew of for this purpose.

The wider context in which that artist did his work may be worth noting in conclusion. I have mentioned echoes of traditions of religious painting and of Emblem books in the Leviathan design. It may also be relevant that Hollar grew up in Prague, where he is known to have taken a close interest in the Imperial art collections, in which the work of Mannerist artists, notably Arcimboldo, had a modestly prominent place. The composition of figures whose outlines are made up of, often symbolically significant, smaller figures was a favourite Mannerist device, with which Hollar himself had experimented. In Holland there was a vogue for Oriental art, including the Chinese and Indian 'caprices' which used precisely the same device, and may in fact have inspired this particular European Mannerist convention. All this is as much a part of the general climate in which the figure of Leviathan was created, as the European tradition of metaphors about the body politic. The packing together of the heads within the drawn version of Leviathan's body seems confirmation that Hollar himself was not unaware of the fact.
Fig. 4. Hollar's engraved portrait of King Charles II (1650), after Diepenbeecke. Reproduced from E. Dostál, Václav Hollar (Prague, 1924), pl. 30
1 The engraved title-page of *Leviathan* is the only original Hobbes title-page Molesworth found it necessary to reproduce.

2 W. Whewell, *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy in England* (London, 1852), 21: 'In the common editions, the face has a manifest resemblance to Cromwell... But in the copy belonging to Trinity College Library, the face appears to be intended for Charles the First... and the text of the book is a separate and worse impression, although the errata are the same with the other copies, as well as the date.' (Quoted in the prefatory Note to A. R. Waller's edition of *Leviathan* (Cambridge, 1904).)

3 D. G. Hale, *The Body Politic* (The Hague, 1971), 128, cites Waller's prefatory Note as the authority for this story.

4 The maps which Hobbes provided for his translation of Thucydides, and his prefatory comment on them, show this clearly enough.

5 See, for example, the large plate which Hollar dedicated to Alethea Howard. (I am indebted to Mrs. M. Corbett for drawing my attention to this, as well as for much other invaluable counsel.) A rather rounded drawing of the eyes can be observed in both cases.

6 The authorities of the National Gallery of Prague, which now incorporates the Hollareum, are of the opinion that the British Library drawing, about which I have consulted them, can be ascribed to Hollar. They make the reservation that this judgement is only based upon the study of a photograph, but consider that 'the softness of the drawing, the modelling of the face, and the artist's hand-writing' can all be related 'to Hollar's best drawings' (19 July 1974). My thanks are due to the National Gallery of Prague for their ready assistance in this matter.


8 F. Sprinzels, *Hollar Handzeichnungen* (Vienna–Prague, 1938), pl. 255. Compare also the massed small figures on pl. 165, 'Hinrichtung in Linz', with the engraved *Leviathan* title-page.

9 The point is made, rather casually, in his Latin verse autobiography. The symbolism traditionally attached to the number Two was division, sin: 'God hates the Dual Number, being knowne the luckless number of division' (Herrick, *Noble Numbers*).


12 See the engraved title-page to John Dee's *A Letter Containing a most brieve Discourse Apogeticall* (London, 1599). (Fig. 3.)


14 See, for example, some of the numerous representations of Charles and his contemporaries inserted into the grangerized Rylands Library copy of E. Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars of England* (Oxford, 1807).


16 A cloak the lining of which is composed of women's heads or faces, in a satirical engraved portrait of the Restoration wit Tom Killigrew (catalogued as by Hollar in the British Museum collection) seems to show a clear recollection of the drawn *Leviathan* title-page, of which indeed it might almost be considered a quiet parody. Killigrew's face and 'crown', in this portrait, are also distinctly reminiscent of *Leviathan*.
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