The Argentinean Hobbesian Studies Association had the initiative to carry out, in 2006, a Seminar on Thomas Hobbes’ thought, with researchers from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Finland and Venezuela, which allowed to appreciate the development of Latin American studies on the English philosopher, as well as the high institutional level achieved by Hobbesian studies in Argentina. The book which gathers the works presented at the Seminar is a proof of it.

María Liliana Lukac, the Association’s President, in her Introduction to the book (“Diverse perspectives on Hobbesian thought”) outlines a broad itinerary on the reception that Hobbes’ work got since the XVII century to our days. This itinerary focuses especially on the development of Hobbesian studies during the XX century. Interpretations on Hobbes as a scientist of Politics are highlighted (Robertson, Stephen, Watkins). There is shown the radically different approach by Strauss, Oakeshott, Taylor and Warrender, who focused, from diverse and sometimes opposed perspectives, on morality regarded as the main comprehension level of Hobbes’ political theory. Record is made of the classical, polemical Marxist-inspired interpretation provided by MacPherson on the links of Hobbes’ thought with the English society of his time. At the same time, the paper reviews the interpretative line led by Quentin Skinner, who makes history and intellectual context the main foundation that allows to understand the meaning of Hobbes’ work. Popkin and Tuck are presented as representatives of the line that stresses Hobbesian skepticism. Two outstanding research groups nowadays are mentioned: the first, led by Martin Bertman, and the second, conducted by Yves Charles Zarka. Among other contemporary interpreters from diverse international academic centers, special mention is made of Aloysius Martinich. Finally, the author refers to Hobbesian studies in Latin America, where, no doubt, the contribution of the Argentinian Hobbesian Studies Association is worth noticing.

The book is divided into three sections. In the first, titled “Historical Perspectives”, we find Margarita Costa’s essay (“Consensus and Power in Hobbes’s \textit{Leviathan}”), where the origin of the debated relation between consensus and power is considered in the light of England’s political history. The author emphasizes the weight that Hobbes attributes to consensus in order to justify absolute power. However, we believe that it is still worth inquiring to what extent that very power became, in turn, the premise upon which Hobbes made his proposal around consensus.

Andrés di Leo Razuk’s text is worth special mention (“Authenticity of Thomas Hobbes’ \textit{Historico-Political Discourses}”). It was a pleasant surprise to know of this paper and at the same time attend, as a part of the Buenos Aires Seminar, to the Spanish translation presentation of this early text of Hobbes’, originally published in 1995 by the University of Chicago. The translation was in charge of Andrés di Leo Razuk, with a preliminary study by Andrés Jiménez Colodrero. The paper presents the textual, contextual and “scientific” reasons grounding the thesis according to which that early text, attributed to William Cavendish, was written by Thomas Hobbes.

Andrés Jiménez Colodrero, author of the above-mentioned preliminary study, in a documented study (“Hobbes and Tacitus: balance and conclusions”), makes use of the \textit{Discourses}, specifically of the “Discourse on Tacitus”, in order to show the similarities
between Hobbes' early ethico-political thought and his late work contained in *Leviathan*. For that he examines, among others, Arnaldo Momigliano's historiographical contributions, and considers especially challenging Richard Tuck- the discussion on Tacitus's presence in XVII century's England, highlighting the ethico-political profile of Hobbes' tacitism.

Eunice Ostrensky's work ("O sábio e o soldado. Thomas Hobbes e seu discípulo"), from an equally historical perspective, shows the shades of the reception obtained by *The Elements of Law* and *De Cive* among realists in 1640's England. By comparing such texts with the work of a scarcely known character of the time, Dudley Digges, the author emphasizes the value that political philosophy acquires for Hobbes right from the moment it became privileged, thus giving place to changes in the original plans of his philosophical project.

Hobbes' defined interest by sacred history texts in order to reinforce his political ideas with prophetic stories is the topic of José Luis Galimidi's paper ("Hobbes and Biblical prophetism"), who shows diverse Bible reading possibilities by means of which Hobbes might have demonstrated -in a sort of Philosophy of History- the inevitable emergence of his political philosophy.

Maria Cristina Spadaro's article ("Thomas Hobbes: why not an utopist"), provides us with a suggestive reflection on the possibility of reading Hobbes within the context of the great modern utopias. Rather than insisting in calling Hobbes "utopist", the author tries to show some similarities between the English thinker and utopistic thought; especially, the common spirit shared by Hobbes with that thought, insofar as he provided a system -a life world- from which answers to the problems of his time could be given.

This section ends with Jorge Alfonso Vargas' work ("Reception of Hobbes in Chile: a pedagogic experience and a personal reflection") where he presents, in an autobiographical tone, the academic role played by Hobbes' philosophy in Chile.

The second section of the book, titled "Philosophical perspectives", comprises firstly Timo Airaksinen's article ("Hobbes on Trust"). From the distinction between "reliance" and "full trust", the author shows how Hobbes does not limit his theory of trust to mere law-safeguarded and coercion, but he incorporates the concept of "full trust", regarded as a shared values condition reinforcing State's validity.

In a line of thought close to the latter we find Luciano Venezia's paper ("Thomas Hobbes' contractualism: moral obligation and reasons to act"), in which, beyond the prudential sense justifying political obedience in virtue of factual considerations derived from state coercion, he emphasizes the weight of the moral normativity contained in natural laws. That way, in contention with David Gauthier's interpretation, contractualism is presented as the foundation of the rationality inherent to political duty.

Omar Astorga's paper ("Imagination, anthropology and politics in *Leviathan*") is an invitation to appraise the concept of imagination in order to appreciate the links between the theory of man and political theory in Hobbes' work. Emphasis is placed on the diverse meanings and uses of such a concept in *Leviathan*, as well as its value to provide an angle that would allow to understand the unity of Hobbes' political thought.

Maria Liliana Lukac ("Breakup with classical philosophy and semantic turn") shows us the way Hobbes, upon using classical philosophy terms, of Aristotelian origin, introduces meanings that lead him to break up with such a tradition. The author analyzes three terms: "nature", "art" and "reason", showing the interrelations Hobbes establishes among them. Emphasis is placed on the sense neither teleological nor normative, but merely mechanical