

Curiosità, linguaggio e ansia.

L'uomo del Leviatano tra differenza antropologica e forme di soggettività

Dimitri D'Andrea*

In Leviathan, unlike what happened in the works of the 1640s, Hobbes succeeds to deduce the entire range of differences between humans and other animals from single foundation: the «pleasure of the mind». This operation is made possible through a redefinition of the pleasure of the mind which frees it from the immediate coincidence with glory, and which characterizes it as pleasure of power/expectation. Language, reason, absence of a summum bonum, unlimited desire for power, anxiety for the future, religion and solicitude for time to come are presented by Hobbes, in the first part of Leviathan, as invariant (universal and necessary) elements of the human nature. However, in the third and fourth parts of Leviathan, forms of subjectivity irreducible to this image of Man enter the scene: not only those which produce and feed the religious conflict (between sects as between the State and the Church) for something worth more than life, but also that – more peripheral, yet conceptually decisive – that gives life to the early Christian communities focused on mutual help and life in common. Thus, religion reveals itself capable of producing forms of subjectivity that dilate the possibilities of the human – in terms of emotional structure, conduct and social forms – beyond the rigid and invariant perimeter traced by the scientific naturalism of the first part.

Keywords: *Hobbes, Pleasure of the mind, Curiosity, Religion, Solicitude for Time to Come.*

Introduzione

Nel *Leviatano*, Hobbes descrive la distanza che separa l'uomo dalle bestie attraverso una pluralità di elementi tra loro eterogenei: capacità, passioni, fenomeni. La religione, il linguaggio, la ragione, l'assenza di un sommo bene, l'ansia per il futuro, il desiderio illimitato di potere, la sollecitudine per il tempo a venire vengono indicati di volta in volta come altrettanti tasselli *invarianti* – universali e necessari – del mosaico della *differenza antropologica*. Tuttavia, nel testo del 1651, a differenza di quanto accadeva nelle versioni preceden-

* Desidero ringraziare Andrea Cerfeda, Enrica Fabbri e Francesco Toto per la disponibilità e l'intelligenza con cui hanno discusso a più riprese con me i temi di questo lavoro.