Bibliographia. Annotated Bibliographies (www.bibliographia.co)

by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: rc@ontology.co

Annotated bibliography of Leibniz's works in English: Third part: Works 1686-1716

Contents of this Section

The Philosophy of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz

First part: Anthologies (I)

Second Part: Anthologies (II). Works 1663-1686

Third part: Works 1686-1716 (Current page)

On the website History of Logic"

Bibliography of Leibniz on Logic and Semiotics:

Studies in English: A - K

Studies in English: L - Z

Works 1686-1716

1. Mason, Haydn Trevor, ed. 1967. *The Leibniz-Arnauld Correspondence*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
First edition: *Briefwechsel zwischen Leibniz, Arnauld und dem Landgrafen Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels*, ed. Carl L. Grotefend (Hanover: Hahn'sche Buchhandlung, 1846). Volume II-1 of *Leibnizens gesammelte Werke*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. With an introduction by G. H. R. Parkinson. Reprint: New York: Garland, 1985.
"The translator of the Leibniz-Arnauld correspondence is faced with a textual problem. Leibniz intended to publish the correspondence, and to this end revised his own copy, which therefore differs in some respects from the letters that Arnauld received. The problem, then, is whether the correspondence is to be translated in its original or in its revised state. What is translated below is the text of the correspondence as Leibniz left it—that is, the text on which he would have based any published edition. Leibniz's copy is the basis of the edition of the correspondence published by C. I. Gerhardt in 1879, as part of Vol. II of *Die philosophischen Schriften von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz*, and the translation has been made from this edition; the letters that Arnauld received are referred to only in so far as they make it possible to correct misreadings in the Gerhardt text, or to repair omissions that affect the sense. To this end, reference has been made to

Leibniz' *Discours de Métaphysique et Correspondance avec Arnauld*, ed. by G. Le Roy (Paris, 1957), which presents the letters as they were received. Grateful acknowledgement is made to the publishers of this edition, Messrs. Vrin, for permission to use Professor Le Roy's text for this purpose. All departures from Gerhardt's text have been indicated in footnotes." (*Translator's Note*, IX)
Contents: Abbreviations VII; Translator's Note IX;
INTRODUCTION
1. A general survey of the correspondence XI; 2. The summary of the *Discourse on Metaphysics*, and the letters of March and April 1686 XV; 3. The letters of May and July 1686 XIX; 4. The letters of September and November 1686, and of March and April 1687 XXVI; 5. The letters of August and October 1687 XXXI; 5. The place of the *Discourse on Metaphysics* and the correspondence with Arnauld in Leibniz's thought XXXIX;
THE CORRESPONDENCE
I. Leibniz to the Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels. 1/11 February 1686 3; II. Arnauld to the Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels. 13 March 1686 9; III. Leibniz to the Landgrave. 12 April 1686 11; IV. Leibniz to the Landgrave. 12 April 1686 18; V. Leibniz to the Landgrave. 5/15 April 1686 22; VI. Arnauld to Leibniz. 13 May 1686 24; VII. Arnauld to the Landgrave. 13 May 1686 35; VIII. The Landgrave to Leibniz. 21/31 May 1686 38; X.Leibniz's 'Remarks upon M. Arnauld's letter' 39; X. Leibniz to Arnauld. 4/14 July 1686 53; XI. Leibniz to Arnauld. 4/14 July 1686 67; XIL Leibniz to the Landgrave. 14 July 1686 73; XIII. Leibniz to the Landgrave. 2/12 August 1686 75; XIV. Arnauld to Leibniz. 28 September 1686 77; XV. The Landgrave to Leibniz. 21/31 October 1686 83; XVI. Draft of a letter from Leibniz to Arnauld 84; XVII. Leibniz to Arnauld. 28 November/8 December 1686 91; XVIII. Leibniz to the Landgrave. 28 November/8 December 1686 102; XIX. Arnauld to Leibniz. 4 March 1687 105; XX. Leibniz to Arnauld. 30 April 1687 113; XXI. Leibniz to Arnauld. 22 july/1 August 1687 130; XXII. Arnauld to Leibniz. 28 August 1687 132; XXIII. Arnauld to the Landgrave. 31 August 1687 138; XXIV. The Landgrave to Leibniz. 11 September 1687 139; XXV. Leibniz to the Landgrave 141; XXVI. Leibniz to Arnauld. 9 October 1687 143; Appendix I to Letter XXVI 163; Appendix II to Letter XXVI 165; XXVII. Leibniz to Arnauld. 4/14 January 1688 166; XXVIII. Leibniz to Arnauld. 23 March 1690 169;
Index of names 175; Index of subjects 178-180.

>

2. Voss, Stephen, ed. 2016. *The Yale Leibniz: The Leibniz-Arnauld Correspondence: With Selections from the Correspondence with Ernst, Landgrave of Hessen-Rheinfels*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
"Leibniz never drew this correspondence into a publication as he had hoped. Appendix 3 of the present volume, "Leibniz Returns to His Correspondence," shows that when he contemplated this project, he invested most of his energy in Letters 1, 13, 14, 18, 20, 23, 29, and 30. In this sketch I have pulled points out of Letters 1, 4, 14, 20, 23, and 30, as well ns Arnauld's 2, 8, 17, 21, and 25. Leibniz's Letter 18 to Landgrave Ernst (8 December 1686) stands apart from the rest because it presents his reasons for valuing the kind of work he is putting into this correspondence. Thought, he proclaims, is the principal function of our soul. We shall always think, but we shall not always live here; this is why what renders us more capable of thinking about the most perfect objects in a more perfect manner is what naturally perfects us. The most important objects of study are therefore immaterial substances, in particular God and the soul, and progress in this study requires knowledge of the true concept of *substance.* II Leibniz had made a book from the items he valued In this correspondence, Letter 18 might have served as its introduction.
2. The Purpose of the Present Volume
I have pointed out the central role that Leibniz's Letters 4, 14, 20, 23, and 30 play in this correspondence. When we examine the extant textual basis for these five

Letters, we discover another shared characteristic. We do not possess the manuscript of any of them—the document that Leibniz wrote and mailed, that Arnauld opened and read. Instead, in each case, we possess one or two drafts and two or three independent copies of the manuscript. But what is of primary interest in these Letters is surely the words that appear in those lost documents.
(...)
"If the manuscript of a Letter is extant, I transcribe it. If only documents that witness to the content of that manuscript exist today, perhaps drafts or copies, I reconstruct it, with the intent of coming as close to the words of the manuscript as those witnesses warrant. Then I display the textual basis for the reconstruction. Finally, I translate the text thus established into English. The need for a fresh translation was clear. In The Leibniz-Arnauld Correspondence, the closest we have had to a standard English version, H. T. Mason translates Leibniz's drafts rather than reconstructions of his Letters when the actual manuscripts are missing; bases his translation not on original documents but on two earlier editions, incorporating many of their inaccuracies; and gives us only about 80 percent of the present text." (pp. XXIII-XXIV)

>

3. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1968. *General Investigations Concerning the Analysis of Concepts and Truths*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
A translation and an evaluation by Walter H. O'Briant.
"An exact dating for Leibniz's composition of *General Investigations Concerning the Analysis of Concepts and Truths* cannot be established since the title and the date 1686 appear to have been added later.(1) Almost surely the final corrections and additions were completed by that date, but just how demanding of his time and energy this work was cannot now be known. Changes in pen and ink indicate that Leibniz was occupied with these investigations during at least three relatively distinct periods,(2) and the numerous changes indicate that he may well have returned to this manuscript again and again, sometimes after a brief respite and sometimes after longer intervals." (*Introduction*, p. 1)
(...)
"*General Investigations* remained in the Hanover Landesbibliothek (formerly Königliche Öffentliche Bibliothek zu Hannover) unpublished and apparently almost entirely unknown until M. Louis Couturat discovered it and published it as a part of his edited selection of Leibniz's writings on logic and related areas in *Opuscules et fragments inédits de Leibniz* (Paris: 1903).(3)
Since the manuscript is in Latin, it has until recently remained rather inaccessible to those interested in Leibniz's logic and related areas. However, in 1960 *General Investigations* appeared in a German translation with several explanatory notes by Franz Schmidt, and in 1966 it appeared in an English translation with introductory essay by G. H. R. Parkinson.(4) The present translation differs from the Couturat, Schmidt, and Parkinson editions in several respects. The most notable difference is the attempt to provide both reference notes to other Leibniz manuscripts (as Couturat mainly does) whenever they are helpful and explanatory notes for the text at hand (as Schmidt occasionally does and as Parkinson attempts in his "Introduction"), along with some treatment of the significance of *General Investigations* for Leibniz's other logical work and related areas of his philosophy." (*Introduction*, p. 2)
(1) Louis Couturat, *Opuscules et fragments inédits de Leibniz*, Paris: Alcan 1903, p 356 n.1 [Ce titre et cette note marginale paraissent avoir été ajoutés après coup.]
(2) These correspond to the following division of the ms.: 20 recto-29 recto, sec. 136; 29 verso, sec. 137-30 verso, sec. 168; 30 verso, sec. 169-31 verso.
(3) The Leibniz manuscripts had earlier been catalogued. See *Die Leibniz-Handschriften der Königlichen Öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Hannover*, beschrieben von Dr. Eduard Bodemann, Oberbibliothekar (Hanover: 1895). It is customary to use the Bodemann catalogue classification in reference when possible. Hereafter,

Bodemann's classification of Leibniz's philosophical works will be denoted by "Phil."; his mathematical works, by "Math."
(4) Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz, *Fragmente zur Logik*, ausgewählt, übersetzt, und erläutert von Franz Schmidt (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960), pp. 241-303, and 510-513. L*ogical Papers*, trans, and ed. G. H. R. Parkinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. xxvi-xlix, 47-87.
>

4. ———. 2021. *General Inquiries on the Analysis of Notions and Truths*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Edited with an English translation by Massimo Mugnai.
"The original manuscript of the GI was composed employing different inks and pen nibs, clear evidence, together with the marginal notes and the many erasures, that Leibniz revised it several times. Some paragraphs, for instance, are crossed out and completely rewritten on the margin of the sheet. This shows that Leibniz pondered at length on the content of the GI [*General Inquiries*[, which is his most complete work entirely devoted to the project of building a new logic.
The text of the GI was published for the first time in 1903 by Louis Couturat in his collection of Leibniz's essays (*Opuscules*: 356–99).
(...)
"For a first critical edition we had to wait until 1982, when Franz Schupp published the Latin text revised from the original manuscript, together with a German translation of it. The definitive critical text was established by the Berlin Academy in 1999 (G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, VI Reihe, IV, pp. 739–88).
Compared with Couturat's pioneering work, Schupp's text was a considerable improvement (it supplied passages that were omitted in the Couturat edition and corrected several mistakes due to a wrong transcription).
The Academy edition, in its turn, improved on Schupp's edition, establishing the correct reading of some words and sentences that were misread by Schupp. In general, however, Schupp's edition continues to be quite reliable and, in some respects, there are even reasons to prefer it to the Academy edition."
(...)
"The present translation has been conducted on the basis of the original manuscript of the GI and of the text established by the Academy of the Sciences of Berlin, taking obvious advantage of the pre-existing translations by Parkinson and O'Briant. In translating the text into English, an attempt has been made to employ the distinction use–mention economically and to distinguish the marginal notes that are supposed to integrate into the text from those that seem to be of a different nature." (*On this edition*, pp. X-XI)
>

5. Rutherford, Donald. 2002. "Leibniz's "On Generosity," With English Translation." *The Leibniz Review* no. 12:15–21.
Translation pp. 18-20.
"The essay "On Generosity"(1) holds a special place among Leibniz's ethical writings.
In no other text does Leibniz give such prominence to the concept of generosity, or relate it to his central doctrine of justice as the charity of the wise.
The circumstances of the piece's composition are uncertain. Watermark dating of the paper places it in the period 1686-1687(?). The Academy editors suggest a connection between it and a text by an unknown author, "Discours sur la generosité,"(2) a transcription of which is found among Leibniz's manuscripts. The paper on which this latter text is written is dated by watermark to the same period as "On Generosity," and the editors plausibly speculate that Leibniz's reading of it may have spurred the composition of his own essay on the topic." (p. 15)
(1) *Sur La Generosité*, A VI.4C, N. 476. Cf. G VII 104-108
(2) A VI. 4C, N. 486.
>

6. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1850. *A System of Theology*. London: Burns and Lambert.
Translated, with introduction and notes by Charles William Russell.
"The *Systema Theologicum* of Leibnitz has occasioned so much discussion on the continent, that an editor in these countries, submitting it to the public for the first time, is hardly at liberty to abstain from noticing the leading facts regarding it which have been elicited in the course of the controversy.
It was first published at Paris in 1819 ; and was reprinted soon after at Maintz, with a German translation. This edition has since been twice reprinted, and seems to have had a very extensive circulation in Germany." (*Introduction*, p. IX)
"The earliest allusion to this interesting work which has as yet been discovered, is contained in a letter of Leibnitz to Ernest, Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels, written in March 1684 [*]. In this letter Leibnitz declares his intention of writing a work upon certain points controverted between Catholics and Protestants, and expresses a hope that his exposition of these controversies may meet the approval of reasonable and moderate men." That we have in the so-called *Systema Theologicum* the realisation of the purpose here expressed, it is impossible to doubt for a moment. Too little is known of Leibnitz s correspondence with this prince(1) (which was frequent and confidential), to enable us to say whether the manuscript was afterwards submitted for his examination." (*Introduction*, p. XVIII)
"Leibnitz s intention of composing such a work is still more explicitly avowed in a letter, written some years later, and addressed, as has been commonly supposed,(2) to another prince, Ernest Augustus, duke of Hanover ; and the details into which this letter (which will be found in a future page) enters with regard to his plan, make it plain, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the manuscript now under consideration is the first draft of this long-projected summary of controversial theology. But notwithstanding this apparently unreserved declaration of his intention, some circumstances, of which we possess no certain knowledge, interfered to prevent the publication and even the completion of the manuscript. It does not appear ever to have been used, or even to have been communicated to any of the author's friends, during his lifetime ; and upon his death it was transferred, along with his other papers, to the Royal Library of Hanover." (*Introduction*, p. XIX-XX)
(1) Feder has given but a few letters in his *Specimina Commercia Epistolici Leibnitiani,* Hanover, 1805, though he says the library contains a fasciculum baud exiguum.
A more extensive collection appeared in 1846, entitled *Briefweclisel zwischen Leibnitz, Arnauld, und den Landgrafen Ernst von Hessen - Rheinfels*; edited by C. L. Grotefend. But even this is evidently incomplete.
(2) It is much more probable that it was written to the Landgrave himself. We shall have occasion to refer to it hereafter at greater length.
[*] "Je veux dresser un jour quelque ecrit sur quelques points de controverse entre les Catholiques et Protestans, et s'il est approuvé´ par des personnes judicieuses et moderés, j'en receuvray beaucoup de joye, mais il ne faut pas qu'on sçache en aucune faç¸on que l'auteur n'est pas dans la Communion." Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe* -Zweite ReheI - Band 1 - 1663-1685, letter n. 245, p. 855.
>

7. Waterman, John T., ed. 1978. *Leibniz and Ludolf on Things Linguistic: Excerpts from their Correspondence (1688-1703)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
"Sometimes, for unexplained reasons, a scholarly work of considerable importance is allowed to pass almost unnoticed into obscurity. The Leibniz-Ludolf correspondence is a case in point. Two of the greatest linguists of their time, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Hiob Ludolf exchanged more than sixty letters that we know of over the years 1688 through 1703. Many of them are devoted either largely or in part to language matters. One letter defines the term "linguistic relationship" in a way which most linguists believe was not formulated until a full century later. Other letters discuss protolanguages and families of languages, ideas which led both men before their deaths to propose linguistic pedigrees or "family

trees"—something which most textbooks tell us, was not done until the mid-nineteenth century.
The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are only now beginning to take their rightful place in the history of linguistics. One of these centuries, the eighteenth, had as one of its most prominent spokesmen in things linguistic the universal genius of his age, G. W. Leibniz. This statement is not yet fully acceptable to all historical linguists. I firmly believe that one day it will be. My hope is that this book will help hasten the day." (*Preface*, p. IX)
Translated and edited with commentary and notes.
Contents: Preface IX; Introduction 1; I. Biographical Sketches 3; II. Correspondence 18; III. Commentary 57; IV. Notes 68; Selected Bibliography 83; Index 87-90.

>

8. de Melo, Wolfgang David Cirilo , and Cussens, James. 2004. "Leibniz on Estimating the Uncertain: An English Translation of *De incerti aestimatione* with Commentary." *The Leibniz Review* no. 14:31–41.
Abstract: "Leibniz's *De incerti aestimatione*, which contains his solution to the division problem, has not received much attention, let alone much appreciation. This is surprising because it is in this work that the definition of probability in terms of equally possible cases appears for the first time. The division problem is used to establish and test probability theory; it can be stated as follows: if two players agree to playa game in which one has to win a certain number of rounds in order to win the pool, but if they break the game off before either of them has won the required number of rounds, how should the pool be distributed?
Our article has two aims: it provides the readers with the first published English translation of *De incerti aestimatione*, and it also gives them a brief commentary that explains Leibniz's philosophical and mathematical concepts necessary in order to understand this work. The translation is as literal as possible throughout; it shows how Leibniz struggled at times to find a solution to the division problem and how he approached it from different angles.
The commentary discusses Leibniz's views on four key concepts: fairness, hope, authority and possibility. The commentary then outlines how Leibniz attempted to solve the problem of division."

>

9. De Risi, Vincenzo. 2005. "Leibniz on Geometry: Two Unpublished Texts with Translation and Commentary." *The Leibniz Review* no. 15:127–132.
The two texts are: *Ars Representatoria* (1691) and *Uniformis locus...* (1692).
"Leibniz pursued the study of his new geometry, the *analysis situs,* throughout his lifetime. The following essays, the *Ars Representatoria* and the text Uniformis locus ... , both go back to the early nineties of the seventeenth century. Although most of the analysis situs texts are still unpublished-which makes it very hard to see how this discipline might have evolved during the years--there seems to be no doubt that the beginning of 1690s marked a breakthrough in Leibniz's studies.
The first noteworthy essays on the new Leibnizean geometry go back to 1679.(1)" (p. 127)
(1) A large collection of them is to be found in G.W. LEIBNIZ, *La caracteristique geométrique*, edited by J. Echeverria and M. Parmentier, Paris 1995.

>

10. Rodriguez-Pereyra, Gonzalo. 2012. "Leibniz's Argument for the Identity of Indiscernibles in his Letter to Casati (with Transcription and Translation)." *The Leibniz Review* no. 22:137–150.
"Leibniz's short letter to the mathematician and physicist Ludovico Casati of 1689 is a short but interesting text on the Principle of Identity of Indiscernibles, to which it is entirely dedicated. Since there is no watermark in the paper of the letter, the letter is difficult to date, but it is likely that it was written during Leibniz's stay in Rome, sometime between April and November of 1689 (A 2 2 287–8). When

addressing the letter, Leibniz wrote ‘Casani’, but this seems to be a mistake and the real addressee is thought to be Ludovico Casati, nephew of Paolo Casati, the Jesuit mathematician. The letter, reproduced in the Berlin’s Academy edition of Leibniz’s works, was first published by Gerhardt in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* in 1892 (Gerhardt 1892: 53–54). It also appears in Robinet’s *Iter Italicum* (Robinet 1988: 134–35). But neither Gerhardt nor Robinet provide a philosophical discussion of the letter, and I am not aware of any other philosophical discussion of it. Furthermore, as far as I know, the letter has never been translated into any language. Thus I shall here provide a transcription (from A 2 2 288–89) and a translation of the letter into English, and a philosophical discussion of its treatment of the Identity of Indiscernibles." (p. 137, a note omitted)

>

11. Cohen, Claudine, and Wakefield, Andre, eds. 2008. *Protogaea*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Latin text and English translation. (First edition Göttingen 1749).
Contents: Acknowledgments XI; Introduction XIII; *Protogaea* 1; Appendix: Text from Friedrich Lachmund's *Oryktographia Hildesheimensis* (1669) 143; Glossary 151; Bibliography 155; Index 165-173.
"*Protogaea,* written between 1691 and 1693, was one of several works from the late seventeenth century to offer a conjectural history of the earth. In it, Leibniz hypothesized about the origins of mountains, volcanoes, and springs. He contemplated the classification of minerals. He demonstrated the organic origin of fossils and tried to explain their presence on mountaintops, and he included a series of engraved plates representing both the fossil remains of animals and cross sections of the caves in which they had been discovered. Leibniz grappled with contemporary works on the earth, including René Descartes’s *Principia philosophiae,* Nicolaus Steno’s *Prodromus*, Thomas Burnet’s *Telluris theoria sacra,* and Agostino Scilla’s *La vana speculazione disingannata dal senso*.(1) He quoted at length from Georgius Agricola, Athanasius Kircher, and Johann Joachim Becher, drawing on a range of evidence that relied not only on theories and textual arguments but also on the practices of excavation, collection, reconstruction, authentication, and experiment. Though deeply committed to general laws and causal explanations, *Protogaea* also relied on the careful examination of fossil objects as “documents” for the history of the earth, drawing on the same methods that Leibniz used in his historical works.
The work also echoed major themes in Leibnizian philosophy, seeking even in geological catastrophe and cataclysm the order and meaning of that best of possible worlds." (*Introduction*, p. XIII)
(1) Descartes [1644] 1983; Burnet 1681; Scilla 1670.
References
Burnet, Thomas. 1681. *Telluris theoria sacra orbis nostri originem & mutationes generales, quas aut jam subiit, aut olim subiturus est, complecten: Libri duo priores de diluvio & paradiso*. London.
Descartes, René. [1644] 1983. Principles of Philosophy. Translated by Valentine Rodger Miller and Reese P. Miller. Dordrecht.
Scilla, Agostino. 1670. Vana speculazione disingannata dal senso. Naples.

>

12. Strickland, Lloyd, ed. 2011. *Leibniz and the two Sophies: The Philosophical Correspondence*. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies.
Correspondence of Leibniz with Sophie, Electress of Hanover (1630–1714) and her daughter, Queen Sophie Charlotte of Prussia (1668–1705).
"Indeed, the extant correspondence between Leibniz and Sophie reveals it to be one of his most extensive, comprising approximately 600 items (letters, drafts, other variants, and other writings), while the extant correspondence between Leibniz and Sophie Charlotte comprises around 150 items (letters, drafts, other variants, and other writings). In neither case do we have the complete correspondence. Some of the letters and texts from the correspondence between Leibniz and Sophie have

simply been lost, as is clear from the fact that certain extant letters and texts refer to items that can no longer be found. No less unfortunate is the fact that none of the final, dispatched copies of Leibniz's letters to Sophie Charlotte have survived; these were presumably burned along with many other papers in Sophie Charlotte's possession shortly after her death in 1705. Much of what does survive from these two correspondences is largely due to Leibniz's obsessive hoarding of letters he received and his drafts of letters he sent. Yet even though neither correspondence comes down to us complete, the surviving items are numerous enough for us to be able to get an accurate view not only of the character of the two correspondences, but also of the characters behind them." (*Introduction*, p. 30).
(...)
"The most complete presentation of the two correspondences is that published by Onno Klopp in volumes 7–10 of G. W. Leibniz, *Die Werke von Leibniz* (vols. 7–9 contain the Sophie-Leibniz correspondence, volume 10 the Sophie Charlotte-Leibniz correspondence). Unfortunately Klopp's edition suffers from numerous faults: the transcriptions of Leibniz's writings are very often defective, and so unreliable; a number of key letters and texts are omitted; and Leibniz's annotations, deletions, marginalia, etc. are not recorded. Fortunately Klopp's work is being superseded by the Berlin Akademie der Wissenschaften's critical edition of Leibniz's writings, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*." (*Introduction*, pp. 64-65, a note omiited).

>

13. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 2003. "On the calculability of the number of all possible truths." *The Leibniz Review*:99–101.
[End of I 693IBeginning of 1694 (?)]
"Thus it will always be necessary that literally a day will come, on which one can say no more than what has been said already, nihil dici, quod non dictum sit prius. For, where one says that which has already been said, or even if one wants to continue to say new things, one will exhaust that which still remains to be said, since this is finite, as we have already shown.
It is a case then of giving a number which is greater than the number of all which can be said or pronounced. It is this which we set out to do." (p. 101)

>

14. Lach, Donald F., ed. 1957. *The Preface to Leibniz' Novissima Sinica*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
First edition: Novissima Sinica, historiam nostri temporis illustratura, 1667
Commentary - Translation - Text.
Table of Contents: Introduction 1; Commentary. Chapter 1, The Question of the Land Route 5; Chapter 2. The Jesuits and Cultural Interchange 21; Chapter 3. Protestant Missions and Brandenburg 39; Chapter 4. Reception and Influence 56; Translation of the Preface 68; The Text of 1699; 87; Index 99-104.
"Unlike many of his contemporaries and fellow philosophers of more recent date, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) was unusually reluctant to publish his writings. Ranging over almost all fields of human endeavor, Leibniz came in touch with most of the intellectual currents of his time. Many of his most profound insights, however, remained buried in his voluminous correspondence until they were dug out and published by others. Those who have sought to picture Leibniz' interest in China have usually depended upon his published and unpublished letters for their documentation. The *Novissima Sinica* ("Latest News of China") is the only book he ever published on a subject which was of consuming interest to him from about 1689 until his death twenty-seven years later.
Only the preface to the *Novissima Sinica* may be attributed to Leibniz' pen. The remainder of the book is a diverse collection of materials which came into his hands by various routes. The Preface, as Leibniz' only major writing on China, printed with his knowledge, may be looked upon as the most authoritative expression of his views on the controversy over the Chinese rites, the role of Russia as intermediary between China and Europe, and the need for Protestant missions to China. The

Preface also reveals to the careful reader the wealth of his information and the depth of his knowledge with regard to China. Finally, the simple fact that Leibniz himself, reluctant to publish as he was, felt impelled to edit, introduce, and publish this book on China indicates the degree of importance he attached to the subject.
The *Novissima Sinica* was first published in 1697. Two years later a revised version made its appearance.(1) The version of 1699 was used in the preparation of this translation, primarily because of its revisions and its clearer type. Where major differences occur between the two prefaces, they are noted in the translation and the attached footnotes. The version of 1699 was enlarged by the inclusion of Father Joachim Bouvet's *Portrait historique de l'empereur de la Chine* (Paris, 1697) in Latin translation." (pp. 1-2).
(1) Neither edition gives the name of a publisher or the place of publication. The Catalogue of the British Museum suggests, however, that the first édition may have been published in Hanover, and the second in Leipzig. In his standard *Bibliographie des oeuvres de Leibniz* (Paris, 1937), E. Ravier makes no reference to publisher or place of publication of the 1699 edition, but indicates (p. 25) that the first edition was printed in Hanover by Förster. The probability is that the second edition also was published by the same house.
"What follows is a translation of the table of contents.
An index of the materials contained in this book:
Those in the first section already published in the preceding year [1697],
1. On the liberty to propagate the Christian religion in China, now finally conceded in 1692. An account, composed by the Rev. Father Joseph Suarez, Portuguese, rector of the College of Peking.
2. An excerpt from the book on astronomy of the Rev. Father Verbiest, printed in China, by the favor of the monarch now reigning.
3. A letter from the Rev. Father Grimaldi to Leibniz, from Goa, December 6, 1693.
4. A letter from the Rev. Father Antoine Thomas of Belgium, from Peking, November 12, 1695.
5. A brief description of the Journey to China made by the Muscovite embassy in the years 1693, 1694, and 1695, more correctly printed.
6.An appendix of excerpts from the letters of the Rev. Father Ger-billon from the city of Nipchou [Nerchinsk], situated in Muscovite territory near the Chinese border, dated September 2 and 3, concerning the war and the peace finally concluded between the Chinese and the Muscovites.
The second section now published for the first time.
7. The Portrait of the Emperor of China now reigning, as delineated by Father Joachim Bouvet, French Jesuit, translated from the French." (note 4, p. 3).

>

15. Lodge, Paul, ed. 2013. *The Yale Leibniz: The Leibniz-De Volder Correspondence: With Selections from the Correspondence Between Leibniz and Johann Bernoulli*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Latin text and English translation.
Contents: Preface XI; List of Abbreviations XV; A Note on the Texts and Translation XVII;
Introduction XXIII. 1. Background to the Correspondence XXIII; 2. Five Phases of Correspondence XXVII; 3. The First Phase of Correspondence XXIX; 4. The Debate Concerning the Measure of Motive Force XXXI; 5. De Voider's Challenge XLV; 6. The Debate Concerning De Volder's Account of Substance LI; 7. The Debate Concerning Extended Substance LX; Leibniz's Empirical Arguments Against a Merely Extended Material World LXVIII; 9. Leibniz's Account of the Material World LXXVI;
The Leibniz-De Volder Correspondence 1-339 [67 letters];
Appendix: Catalogue of the Leibniz-De Volder-Bernoulli Correspondence 341; Notes 345; Bibliography 389; Index of Names 399; Index of Subjects 403-415.
"This volume contains letters from two separate correspondences, the one between Leibniz and De Voider and the other between Leibniz and Johann Bernoulli.

(...)
The standard edition of the Leibniz-De Voider correspondence appears in volume 2 of C. I. Gerhardt's *Die philosophische Schriften von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz*. The edition contains a transcription of all of De Volder's letters and of those drafts which appear to represent the most complete versions of Leibniz's letters. It also includes transcriptions of some *marginalia* as well as the long draft of Letter 20, material from the early draft of Letter 67, and the long deletion that appears as Supplement 2 to Letter 29. The standard edition of the Leibniz-Bernoulli correspondence appears in volume 3 of C. I. Gerhardt's *Leibnizens Mathematische Schriften.*
(...)
The largest collection of translations of the Leibniz-De Voider correspondence into English is in Leroy Loemker's edition of the *Philosophical Papers and Letters*, which contains partial translations of ten of Leibniz's letters (Letter 17, the Supplement to Letter 20, and Letters 24, 40, 46, 50, 53, 55, 61, and 67). Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber include partial translations of Letters 17, 50, 61, 64, and 67—including the draft material that appears as Supplement 2 to Letter 67 in this volume — in *Leibniz: Philosophical Essays*; Philip P. Wiener includes partial translations of Letters 17, 20, 40, 42, 46, and 50 in *Leibniz: Selections*; and Lloyd Strickland includes partial translations of Letters 17 and 61 in *G. W. Leibniz, The Shorter Leibniz Texts*." (pp. XVII-XVIII)

>

16. De Risi, Vincenzo. 2006. "Leibniz around 1700: Three Texts on Metaphysics." *The Leibniz Review* no. 16:55–69.
The three texts are: Bodemann LH IV, III, 5e, Bl. 30r (*De realitate*, 1700); Bodemann LH IV, I, 14c, Bl. 3r (*Divisiones* [1700]); Bodemann LH IV, III, 5e, Bl. 23r (*Entia per aggregationem* [1704]).
"The three short texts – never before published – that follow go back to the very first years of the 18th century. They deal with several metaphysical issues of great relevance to the development of Leibniz's monadological system – issues which also often recur in other works of the period and in the correspondence of those years. Their worth in fact seems essentially that of furnishing further documentary evidence of the development of Leibniz's mature thinking on some philosophical issues that have known conspicuous oscillations in their theoretical formulations. Although some recent criticism, availing itself of the volumes of Leibniz's works published by the Academy, has gone into the origin and early development of Leibniz's metaphysics in great depth and detail, the period from the *Discours de métaphysique* (1686) to the late *Monadologie* (1714) tends nevertheless to be regarded by most scholars as just one stretch. Therefore, one of the next tasks set to the Leibnizian historiography seems to be that of tracing the contour (if there is any) of the development of Leibniz's metaphysics in the philosopher's last thirty years. A history, that is, that means to show whether and how the doctrinal oscillations of the mature monadology let themselves be reconciled into one direction, and whether in such a development any fracture points can be singled out or not (just as they can, for example, as I think, in the doctrine of space in the mid-nineties). In order to carry on such a historical reconstruction possibly more documents will be needed than those now available throughout the 18th-century editions. Thus, going back as they do exactly to the middle of the period in question, the three following fragments represent a small contribution to the larger task." (p. 55)

>

17. Mugnai, Massimo. 1997. "An Unpublished Latin Text on Terms and Relations* (LH 7 C Bl. 76 v.). Transcribed and Translated by Massimo Mugnai, University of Florence." *Leibniz Society Review* no. 7:125–127.
"This text has not appeared in the Vorausedition. It belongs to the late period of Leibniz's life (after 1700), and is remarkable because it (i) discusses at length the relationships between the intension and extension of terms; and (ii) develops a quite interesting analysis of the nature of space, time, and, in general, relations." (p. 125)

>

18. ———. 2000. "Two Leibniz Texts with Translations: LH IV 1, 9 r and LH IV 1, Bl. 24 r." *The Leibniz Review* no. 10:135–137.
The first text (LH IV 1, 9 r) was written on a very small piece of paper and probably belongs to a period after 1700. Very similar issues are discussed in the following passages from two letters, respectively, to De Volder (a) and to Des Bosses (b)" (p. 136)
(...)
The second text probably was composed after 1695.
a = *Gerhard, Philosophische Schriften* 2, p. 253.
b = *Correspondence with De Volder* 1703; L, p. 531.
>

19. Murray, Michael J., ed. 2011. *The Yale Leibniz: Dissertation on Predestination and Grace*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Translated, edited and with an Introduction by Michael J. Murray. Additional Contributions by George Wright.
Date of composition: 1701, between then and ca. 1706; first edition of the Latin text.
Contents: Preface VII; List of Abbreviations XI; A Note on the Texts and Translations XIII;
Introduction. 1. Leibniz, on Church Reunion and the Background of *De praedestinatione* XV; 2. The Issues Raised in Burnet's Commentary XXI; 3. Leibniz's Remarks on Burnet XXXII; 4. Conclusion LI;
Dissertation on Predestination and Grace 1; Article XVII of and Burnet's Commentary on *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England* 3; Leibniz's Commentary on Burnet 38;
Notes 153; Suggestions for Further Reading 167; Index of Names 169; Index of Subjects 171-172.
"*De praedestinatione et gratia dissertatione* is an important work for two principal reasons. First, it provides us with a great deal of additional material concerning topics that have recently attracted the attention of Leibniz scholars. Second, as noted, De praedestinatione fills an important gap in the available corpus of published Leibniz texts since it is without doubt the longest and most important theological work he composed between the late 1680s, when he wrote the *Systema theologicum* and the *Discourse on Metaphysics*, and the last decade of his life, when he published the *Theodicy*." (*Preface*, p. VII)
(...)
"The focus of *De praedestinatione* is the Protestant disagreement over the issues of divine providence generally and election to salvation in particular.
Broadly speaking there are three main positions on these issues defended by Protestants: Calvinism, Arminianism—the view largely endorsed by most Lutherans—and Socianianism. As Socianianism was widely rejected as heretical, the most important theological and philosophical battles were fought between Calvinists and Arminians. The views of the Arminians had been codified in 1610 in the Articles of Remonstrance, which led to a reaction on the part of Calvinists, who in turn set out their "five points of Calvinism" in the Canons of Dort in 1618.
Leibniz sets his comments on this debate against the backdrop of Gilbert Burnet's *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England* (1699). The Thirty-Nine Articles represents a statement of various points of doctrine assembled by Anglican divines during the sixteenth century." (*Preface*, p. VIII)
(,,,)
"*De praedestinatione* also provides us with a glimpse of Leibniz's philosophical and theological views on these topics in the crucial period between the publication of the *Discourse on Metaphysics* and the *Theodicy.*
Aside from the essays included in Grua's *Textes inédits,* those interested in Leibniz's theological thought in his later years have had little to go on but the *Theodicy*. And much of the material found in the Grua volumes is in the form of reading notes or essays in progress, rather than works that Leibniz honed into publishable form. As a

result, *De praedestinatione* stands to fill an important gap in the current understanding of Leibniz on these issues." (*Preface*, p. IX)
References
Gaston Grua (ed.), *Textes inédits d'aprés les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque provinciale d'Hanovre*, Paris, Presses universitaire de France, 1948, (two volumes).
On this edition see the review by Irena Backus:
https://biblioscout.net/content/99.140005/stl201202024601.pdf
"The editor, although he apparently consulted the Hanover Ms, considers *De praedestinatione* (p. vii) as "the longest and most important theological work he [Leibniz] composed between the late 1680s, when he wrote *Systema theologium* (sic! – should be theologicum) and the *Discourse on Metaphysics*, and the last decade of his life, when he published the *Theodicy*". (...) Had the editor consulted the AA [Akademie Ausgabe] or its editorial team, he would have seen that by far the most important theological work produced by Leibniz in collaboration with [Gerhard Wolter] Molanus [1633-1722] in the period between 1697 and 1710, is the *Unvorgreiffliches Bedencken über eine Schrifft genandt Kurtze Vorstellung* (UB) which is extant in two distinct versions, dating from ca. 1697-1698 which differ considerably from one another, especially in their section on predestination, which is much shorter in the second version (A IV, 7, 182-3721)." Irena Backus, cit. p. 246)
On the *Unvorgreiffliches Bedencken* ("Unprejudiced Thoughts") by Leibniz see Patrick Riley, "Review of G.W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe, Reihe IV, Politische Schriften, Band 7 (1697-1699)*", *The Leibniz Review.* 21, 2011, pp. 119-151.
This text is translated in French in D. E. [Daniel Errnst] Jablonski et G. W, Leibniz, *Negotium Irenicum. L'union des Êglises protestants selom G. W. Leibniz et D. E. Jablonski*, Édition de Claire Rösler-Le Van, Paris: Classiques Garnier 2013, pp. 983-1099.
>

20. Mugnai, Massimo. 2009. "“On extrinsic denominations” (LH IV, iii, 5a-e, Bl. 15): Transcription and English Translation." *The Leibniz Review* no. 19:64–66.
"For the date of composition we have a clear terminus post quem: Parent's *Elements of mechanics* (1700). Therefore, we may conjecture that Leibniz wrote this remark in the early months of 1702 (see below, note 4)."
Note 4: "Cfr. Antoine Parent (1666-1716), Elemens de mechanique et physique, Paris, 1700. In his correspondence with Bernoulli, Leibniz mentions many times Parent's *Elements of mechanics and physics:* in a letter dated 24 June 1702 he speaks of this book as if he had read it very recently (cf. Gerhardt, *Mathematische Schriften* 3, p. 708).
>

21. Ottaviani, Osvaldo, and Arthur, Richard T. W. 2021. "Leibniz's *Ad schedam Hamaxariam*: Imroduction, Text and Translation." *The Leibniz Review* no. 31:61–101.
"This piece consists in a critical commentary by Leibniz on a tract [scheda] by Gabriel Wagner. This was not obvious from its curious title, *Ad schedam Hamaxariam* (hereafter AsH), which puzzled Leibniz's editors for some time.(3) That mystery was solved by Massimo Mugnai, who, along with Heinrich Schepers, was the first to recognize the importance of the tract. In the course of preparing a transcription, Mugnai suggested that since *hamaxa* is Greek for wagon, *hamaxaria* must be a pun on the name Wagner ("wagoner" or "waggoner" in English).(4) In fact, 'Hamaxarius' seems to be a standard Latinization of the name Wagner,(5) and the resonance of the views discussed and quoted with what we know of the views of Gabriel Wagner (1660–1717?) confirms this identification." (p. 61)
(3) In Bodemann's catalogue, for example, where it appears as LH IV, 3, 5c, Bl. 1-2, the title is followed by a question mark between parentheses (Bodemann 1895, 68).
(4) Mugnai also published a short passage concerning logic from Leibniz's text in Mugnai (1990, 77), and also in his seminal book on Leibniz's theory of relations

(Mugnai 1992, 26 n. 47, and 111).
(5) For example, see the volume: Ignatius Hamaxarius (i.e. Ignaz F. Wagner), *Fromme Wünsche eines Katholiken bei der dritten Jubelfeier der Reformation Luthers,* Wittenberg ; Freyberg : Cratz & Gerlach 1818.
References
Bodemann, Eduard. 1895. *Die Leibniz-Handschriften der königlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Hannover*, Hannover und Leipzig: Hahn'sche Buchhandlung.
Mugnai, Massimo. 1990. "A Systematic Approach to Leibniz's Theory of Relations and Relational Sentences", *Topoi*, 9, 61-81.
Mugnai, Massimo. 1992. *Leibniz' Theory of Relations*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
>

22. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1896. *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding*.
First edition: Rudolf Erich Raspe (éd.), *Oeuvres philosophiques latines & françoises de feu Mr. de Leibnitz*, Amsterdam, Leipzig 1765, pp. 1-496.
Edited and translated by A. G. Langley together an Appendix consisting in some of his shorter pieces.
Appendix: I. Leibnitz to Jacob Thomasius. April 20-30, 1669 631; II. Fragment, (c. 1671) 651; III. Demonstration against atoms taken from the contact of atoms. (October, 1690) 652; IV. Essay on Dynamics on the laws of motion, in which it is shown that not the same quantity of motion is preserved, but the same absolute force, or rather the same quantity of moving action (*l'action motrice*). (c. 1691) 657; V. Essay on Dynamics in defence of the wonderful laws of nature in respect to the forces of bodies, disclosing their mutual actions and referring them to their causes. Part I. 1695. 670; Ib. Part II. 1695 684; VI. On the radical origin of things. 1697.692; VlI. Appendix to a letter to Honoratus Fabri 1702 699; VIII. Letter of Leibnitz to Basnage de Beauval, editor of the "Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants," printed in that journal, July, 1698, pp. 329 sq 706; IX. Fragment of a letter to an unknown person 1707 712; X. That the most perfect Being exists 714; XL What is idea 716; XII. On the method of distinguishing real from imaginary phenomena 717.
"The work here-with given to the public consists of & translation of the entire fifth volume of Gerhardt's *Die philosophischen Schriften von G. W. Leibniz*, sub-entitled " Leibniz und Locke," consisting of an Introduction by Gerhardt, several short pieces on Locke's *Essay* and the *New Essays on Human Understanding*; and of an Appendix containing a translation of other short pieces of Leibnitz bearing on the subjects discussed in the New Essays or referred to therein. The Introduction on The Philosophy of Leibnitz by the translator suggested and urged by Professors Palmer and Royce of Harvard University, and for some time contemplated, is deferred, and reserved, if at all, for another time and occasion, owing to the size of the present volume, as well as for other good and sufficient reasons which it is not necessary here to mention." (*Translators' Preface*, p. XI)
>

23. Remnant, Peter, and Bennett, Jonathan, eds. 1981. *New Essays on Human Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Contents: Preface; Book I: Of innate notions; Book II: Of ideas; Book III: Of words; Book IV: Of knowledge; Notes; Reference; Index.
"Within five years of the first appearance of Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), Leibniz had read at least some of it, and had written several pages of comments - some appreciative, some mildly critical - upon parts of the work, allowing an intermediary to pass them on to Locke. (1) The latter received them sourly, writing to a friend with a sceptical allusion to Leibniz's 'great name', and concluding that 'even great parts will not master any subject without great thinking, and even the largest minds have but narrow swallows' (Locke to Molyneux, April 1697). The letter containing that remark was published in 1708, and Leibniz later wrote: 'I am not surprised by it: we differed rather too much in principles' (Leibniz to Remond, March 1714)." (*Introduction*, p. VII)

(1) This, like most of the historical remarks in this section, is backed by references in the Introduction to the Academy edition of the *Nouveaux essais* (see p. xxxviii below), which also supplies full details of references which we give in truncated form.
"The English language must have been something of a barrier between Leibniz and Locke's long, difficult book. In a letter admitting the imperfections in his French, he wrote: 'I only wish I had the same knowledge of the English language; but not having had the occasion for it, the most I can manage is a tolerable understanding of books written in that language;(2) and on p. 462 of the present work there is a small but striking indication of his not being at home with English." (*Introduction*, p. VII)
(2) Leibniz to Burnett, 27 July 1696, LPG III, p. 181. All dates are given in terms of the Gregorian calendar, though this was not adopted by the German Lutheran states until 1700 and in Britain not until 1752.
LPG = *Die philosophischen Schriften von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz*, ed. C. I. Gerhardt, Berlin, 1875-90.
"The situation changed in 1700 with the publication of Pierre Coste's French version of the *Essay,* under the title *Essai philosophique concernant l'entendement humain*, based primarily on the fourth edition.
(...)
Leibniz apparently did not seriously start reading Coste until about mid-1703; and about then he also began writing the critical commentary which eventually became the *New Essays on Human Understanding*. In this, he relied heavily on Coste's version, and probably had little further recourse to the English text."
(...)
The writing was done, Leibniz says, hastily and with many interruptions. The first draft was finished in May 1704. Between then and August of that year Leibniz did a good deal of revising, and recast the first two Books into dialogue form (the third and fourth were dialogues from the outset). Linguistic and stylistic changes were also being made: the Academy editors report interventions by eight correctors. A fair copy, with revisions and corrections by Leibniz and others, was completed at about the time Locke died (November 1704)." (*Introduction*, p. VIII)

>

24. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1855. *A Refutation Recently Discovered of Spinoza by Leibniz*. Edinburgh: Thomas Coinstable & Co.
With prefatory remarks and introduction by Louis-Alexandre Foucher de Careil. Translated by Octavius Freire Owen.
First edition: *Réfutation inédite de Spinoza* précedé d'un mémoire par A. Foucher de Careil, Paris 1855; date of composition 1706.
"The library at Hanover, where the librarian was kind enough to facilitate my search, possesses in its archives, a manuscript by Leibnitz, entitled, "Critical Remarks on a Book by J. G. Wachter upon the Secret Philosophy of the Hebrews." This unpublished article, entirely written by Leibnitz, includes a refutation of Spinoza by him. We might wonder at finding it in a. bundle .of papers bearing the name of Wachter, did we not know that the latter, a philosopher and theologian, who, in his time, was strongly suspected of Spinozism, and well versed in the Kabbala, had just undertaken to compare the Kabbala with Spinoza, and to point out their similarity, in a book called " De Recondita Hebraeorum Philosophia, aut Elucidarius Cabbalisticus [1706]." The object of Wachter's book is, as the title indicates, to unfold the secret philosophy of the Hebrews, and especially to determine the amount of legitimate influence which the Kabbala may claim, on one of the most doubtful of its disciples, Benedict Spinoza. If we are to believe Wachter, this influence was immense; the Kabbala already contained the whole of Spinoza's pantheism.
Mr. Frank [Adolphe Franck 1810-1893], the author of a valuable work on the Kabbala, has already pointed out the improbability of this myth, invented by Wachter, according to which, the foe of tradition, would only have followed the traditional philosophy of the authors of his nation. According to Mr. Frank, the

preponderant influence of Cartesianism effaced all traces of the Kabbala, and suffices to explain everything.
In my opinion, Leibnitz takes a middle course between these two opinions so distinctly decided. After having mentioned, in his letter to the Abbé Nicaise, in 1697, the seeds of Cartesianism cultivated by Spinoza, at a later period, when better informed, he cannot help acknowledging, in his *Theodicea*, that Spinoza was versed in the Kabbala of the authors of his nation, and he mixes him up with an entirely Kabbalistic tradition, which, in fact, Spinoza appears to have followed." (A. Foucher de Careil, pp. 113-115).
References
Adolphe Franck, *La Kabbale ou La Philosophie Religieuse des Hébreux*, Paris 1843.
>

25. Look, Brandon, and Rutherford, Donald, eds. 2007. *The Yale Leibniz: The Leibniz-Des Bosses Correspondence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Contents: Preface IX; List of Abbreviations XIII; A Note on the Texts and Translation XV; Introduction XIX; 1. Background XX; 2. The Role of Correspondences XXI; 3. The Search for Accord XXIII; 4. Leibniz and the Jesuits: China and the Universal Church XXV; 5. Jansenism XXIX; 6. The Metaphysics of Substance XXXVIII; 7. The Union of Soul and Body XLV; 8. Composition and the Unity of Corporeal Substance XLIX; 9. The Problem of Transubstantiation LVII; 10. Leibniz on Transubstantiation and the Vinculum Substantiate LX; 11. Leibniz's Final Metaphysics: Idealism or Realism? LXXII-LXXIX;
The Leibniz-Des Bosses Correspondence 1; Appendix: Catalogue of the Leibniz-Des Bosses Correspondence 381; Notes 389; Bibliography 455; Index of Names 463; Index of Subjects 470-477.
"For the benefit of Leibniz scholars, this edition also includes a new, critical, original-language text. Unlike previous volumes in the Yale Leibniz series, which could adopt the Akademie edition text, the Latin presented on the left-hand pages was generated by our careful examination of the original manuscripts or copies thereof." (*Preface*, pp. IX-X)
"The most extensive translation of the correspondence is the French edition of Fremont (*L'Être et la relation*, Paris: Vrin, 1981, revised edition 1999). Fremont translates thirty-seven of Leibnizs letters as they are found in the Gerhardt edition. The largest collection of letters translated into English is found in Loemker's edition. Loemker provides partial translations of twelve of Leibniz's letters and four of Des Bosses's. One further letter and a supplement to a letter have been published in English by Ariew and Garber.
To date there exists no complete, critical edition of the Leibniz-Des Bosses correspondence. One will appear ultimately as part of Reihe II of the Deutsche Akademie edition of Leibniz's writings, which is being prepared at the Leibniz-Forschungsstelle, Münster. However, no date has been set for the completion of this task. Our edition of the Latin text of the correspondence does not aspire to the comprehensiveness of the Akademie edition. Space constraints have limited us to the publication of 71 (32 from Des Bosses and 39 from Leibniz) of the 138 letters that are known to make up the correspondence. Although this may seem a relatively modest proportion, we have endeavored to include all the letters with significant philosophical content and most of those with significant theological content. Many that remain are no more than brief notes, which indicate, for example, a change in travel plans or transmit a letter from a third party. In our selection of letters we have also, so far as is possible, attempted to preserve the flow of the correspondence, matching query with response, so as to facilitate an understanding of the sustained philosophical debate in which the two correspondents were engaged." (*Preface*, p. XVI).
>

26. Hilliger, Walter, ed. 2022. *Leibniz' Anthology of Maimonides' Guide* Shehakol Inc.
According to Leibniz' manuscripts (c. 1708).

First complete English translation, introduction, and annotations by Walter Hilliger; Foreword: *Leibniz Encounters Maimonides*, by Lloyd Strickland, pp. 6-11.
"As for Leibniz's reading notes on the Buxtorf edition of the *Guide,* the paper contains watermarks attested to 1685 and 1708; the former is clearly too early for the date of composition, as Leibniz had not read the Guide even by 1707, as we have seen. However, the latter date is a good fit.
In which case it is likely that Leibniz encountered Maimonides late in life, probably around 1708, eight years before his death. We could even speculate that the catalyst for his reading Maimonides was the passage he encountered in Bayle's *Dictionary*, a passage that suggested there were sympathies, perhaps even overlaps, between Maimonides' thought and his own, this prompting him to get hold of Buxtorf's translation. And certainly, as his reading notes on the *Guide* indicate, Leibniz did find plenty of things in Maimonides' thought worthy of his attention and approval." (*Foreword*, p. 11)
References
Moses Maimonides, *Doctor perplexorum*, transloated by Johann Buxtorf, Basel: König, 1629.
"Leibniz' notes of the *Guide* in Latin were discovered and partially translated into French by Count Louis-Alexandre Foucher de Careil (Paris, 1861)." (p. 23)
(...)
"Also, Foucher de Careil's version omitted Leibniz' commentaries on chapters 27 and 32, the 1st chapter of the second part, and chapters 22, 23, 25 to 28, 31, 32, 51, and 54 of the third part. An English translation of this incomplete version was published in the Journal of Jewish Studies by Lenn Evan Goodman, *Maimonides and Leibniz* (Hawaii, 1980), which unfortunately included the shortcomings of the incomplete French translation." (pp. 24-25(

>

27. Olivieri, Lucia. 2019. "The Leibniz-Treuer Correspondence." *The Leibniz Review* no. 29:83–104.
With text and English translation of excerpts from Treuer's *De mente sensu non errante* and Correspondence with Leibniz.

>

28. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 2016. *The Yale Leibniz: The Leibniz-Stahl Controversy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Translated, Edited and with an Introduction by François Duchesneau and Justin E. H. Smith.
"The Leibniz-Stahl controversy arguably represents the most significant of Leibniz's mature interventions on questions concerning the structure, organization, motion, and unity of natural beings, but it is also, surely, one of the most difficult to penetrate, in part because in order to do so rigorously, one must engage with the arcane language and florid reasoning of the inimitable G. E. Stahl. Because of these daunting conditions, no prior scholars dared to take on the project of a full edition of the Leibniz-Stahl exchange (except for Théodose Blondin, whose French translation of 1859–64 amounts rather to an approximate paraphrasing)." (*Preface*, P. VII)
References
Théodose Blondin, *Negotium otiosum: Réfutation des objections formulées sous le voile de l'anonyme contre quelques points fondamentaux de la Vraie Théorie médicale par un philosophe célèbre battu par ses propres armes*, Paris: J.-B. Baillière, 1864 (*OEuvres médico-philosophiques de G.-E. Stahl,* vol. 6)
"The Latin texts of the controversy between Leibniz and Stahl included here reproduce the contents of the *Negotium otiosum*, which Stahl published in Halle in 1720 (NO; page numbers in the margins refer to this edition). In this edition page 216 was duplicated and the following pages numbered from 217 on. In order to reflect this we have changed the second page 216 to read 216{217}, the next page to read 217{218}, and so on. In preparing our edition, besides correcting patent clerical errors in the original, we took into account the differences that could be

noted between the printed texts and the extant manuscripts in the Leibniz-Archiv." (p. XI)
"After Leibniz's death in 1716, Stahl decided to publish these writings with the addition of a preface, a survey of the principal points of doubt, and his final replies. As a result, N*egotium otiosum seu ΣKIAMAXIA adversus positiones aliquas fundamentales Theoriae medicae verae a Viro quodam celeberrimo intentata sed adversis armis conversis enervata* (*A Futile Affair; or, Shadowboxing Waged Against Some Fundamental Positions of the "True Medical Theory" by a Certain Celebrated Man, but Undone by His Own Arms Turned Back upon Him*), appeared in 1720.
Leibniz's *Animadversions* and *Exceptions* were republished from the *Negotium otiosum* version under the title *G. G. Leibnitii Animadversiones circa assertiones aliquas Theoriae Medicae verae Clar. Stahlii, cum ejusdem Leibnitii ad Stahlianas observationes responsionibus* (*G. W. Leibniz's animadversions on certain assertions of the great Stahl's Theoria medica vera, with the responses of the same Leibniz to Stahl's observations*), in Leibniz's *Opera Omnia,* edited by Louis Dutens in 1768. (73)" (*Introduction*, p. XLIII)
(73) D II.ii, 131–61. [D = *Gothofredi Guillelmi Leibnitii Opera Omnia*, 6 vols., ed. L. Dutens (Geneva: De Tournes, 1768; reprint ed., Hildesheim: Olms, 1989).
>

29. Farrer, Austin, ed. 1952. *Theodicy; Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
First edition Amsterdam 1710.
With an introduction by Austin Farrer, translated by E. M. Huggard from C. J. Gerhardt's edition of the *Collected Philosophical Works*, 1875-90.
"The discussion with Locke was a failure: Locke would not play, and the book in which the whole controversy was to be systematized never appeared. The discussion with Bayle, on the other hand, was a model of what a discussion should be. Bayle played up tirelessly, and was never embarrassingly profound; he provided just the sort of objections most useful for drawing forth illuminating expositions; he was as good as a fictitious character in a philosophical dialogue. And the book in which the controversy was systematized duly appeared with great éclat.
Here is the history of the controversy. In 1695 Leibniz was forty-nine years old. He had just emerged from a period of close employment under his prince's commands, and he thought fit to try his metaphysical principles upon the polite world and see what would come of it. He therefore published an article in the *Journal des Savants* under the title: 'New System of Nature and of the Communication of Substances, as well as of the Union between Soul and Body'. In the same year Foucher published an article in the *Journal* controverting Leibniz; and in the next year Leibniz replied with an 'Explanation'. A second explanation in the same year appeared in Basnage's *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants,* in answer to reflexions by the editor. M. Pierre Bayle had all these articles before him when he inserted a note on Leibniz's doctrine in his
article on 'Rorarius', in the first edition of his *Historical and Critical Dictionary*. The point of connexion between Rorarius and Leibniz was no more than this, that both held views about the souls of beasts." (*Introduction*, p. 36)
"Leibniz published a reply to Bayle in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants* for July 1698. As in all his references to Bayle, he is studiously polite and repays compliment for compliment." (*Introduction*, p. 39)
"Leibniz passes from the remarks about his own doctrine under the article 'Rorarius' to other articles of Bayle's dictionary, and touches the question of the origin of evil, and other matters which receive their fuller treatment in the *Theodicy*.
In the same year Leibniz wrote a very friendly letter to Bayle himself, offering further explanations of disputed points." (*Introduction*, p. 49)
"The text had its origin in a series of conversations between Leibniz and Sophie Charlotte, Queen of Prussia, about the works of Pierre Bayle, the Calvinist scholar and author of the highly popular and philosophically rich *Historical and Critical*

Dictionary. Leibniz collected his notes from these discussions and expanded them into the *Theodicy*. This origin contributes to the somewhat conversational feel of the text—a tone that is, admittedly, easily missed by readers unfamiliar with the conventions and issues of Leibniz's time. Despite this somewhat casual origin, Leibniz believed that the *Theodicy* contained the core of his lifelong considerations on the topics of evil, freedom, and the beneficence of God. In fact, Leibniz intended to follow up this work with a more rigorously defended system of philosophy that filled out these central points more fully, but he died six years after its initial publication and before his larger goal could be realized." Larry M. Jorgensen and Samuel Newlands (eds.), *New Essays on Leibniz's Theodicy*, New York: Oxford University Press 2014, *Introduction*, p. 2)

>

30. Look, Brandon. 1998. "On an Unpublished Manuscript of Leibniz (LH IV.I.laBI.7)*: New Light on the *Vinculum Substantiale* and the Correspondence with Des Bosses." *Leibniz Society Review* no. 8:69–79.
"Explaining the nature of composite substance always posed a challenge for Leibniz. In this paper, I shall provide a transcription, translation and interpretation of an unpublished text in which Leibniz considers the issue of composite substance and the real unity of monads.(1) While the manuscript has not yet been dated by those working in the Leibniz-Archiv, given that Leibniz discusses the issues in the way he does, the text must have been written between the years of 1712 and 1716. Indeed, this text is, to my mind, particularly fascinating precisely because it echoes certain themes in Leibniz's correspondence with Des Bosses, themes that have traditionally piqued the interest of Leibniz scholars and that have generally been thought to be confined to the Leibniz-Des Bosses correspondence." (p. 69)
(1) lit is *not* my intention to provide an Akademie-quality transcription; I shall leave that job to the editors in Hanover.

>

31. Rescher, Nicholas, ed. 1991. *Leibniz Monadology: An Edition for Students*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Contents: Preface VII; 1. Introduction 3; 2. Translation of the *Monadology* 17; 3. The Thematic Structure of the *Monadology* 31; 4. Leibniz's Use of Analogies and Principles 37; 5. Text and Commentary 45; Index of Key Terms and Ideas 309; Index of French Terms and Expressions 315; Index of References 321-323.
"The present work is an act of piety in its attempt to compile on his behalf the book that Leibniz himself never wrote. For there is no representative work of his to which teachers of seventeenth-century thought can send their students as they send them to Descartes' *Meditations* or Spinoza's *Ethics.* The object of the book is to fill this gap. Taking the *Monadology*-that telegraphic summary of Leibniz's system of philosophy-as its organizing table of contents, the book collects together some of his widely scattered discussions of the philosophical ideas and theses at issue. This procedure achieves a dual result, providing on the one hand a commentary on the *Monadology* by Leibniz himself, and, on the other, an exposition of his philosophy using the *Monadology* as an outline. Such an approach assigns to the *Monadology* what is surely its most useful and appropriate function: that of a gateway into the thought-structure of the Leibnizian philosophy at large." (*Preface*, p. VII)
"The *Monadology* [written in 1714] was first published by Heinrich Koehler in a German translation (*Leibnizens Lehr-Sätze iiber die Monadologie* etc. [Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1720)). In his subsequent edition of Leibniz's works (*Opera Omnia* [Geneva, 17 68)), Ludovico Dutens included a Latin translation based on this German version of Koehler's. A version of the original French text was first published in J. E. Erdmann's edition of Leibniz's philosophical works (*Opera Omnia* [Berlin, 1840]).
The French text of the Monadology that is given here is based on the magisterial edition of André Robinet, G. W. Leibniz: *Principes de la Nature et de la grace fondés en raison* et *Principes de la philosophie ou Mondalogie* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 195 4). For other Leibniz texts, I rely on C. I. Gerhardt,

Die philosophischen Schriften van Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, 7 vols. (Berlin : Weidmann, 187 5-90).
This work I cite simply as G, with the *Monadology* given in G VI, 607-23." (*Introduction*, p. 13)
>

32. Strickland, Lloyd, ed. 2014. *Leibniz's Monadology: A New Translation and Guide*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
"The *Monadology* was first translated into English in 1867 by Frederick Henry Hedge, who published his translation as an article in *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy.*(29) This made the *Monadology* one of the first of Leibniz's philosophical works to be available in English translation (although English-language anthologies of Leibniz's philosophical writings are commonplace today, they only started to appear in the last decade of the nineteenth century). Today the number of different English translations of the text is almost into double figures: a translation of it is included in most English-language anthologies of Leibniz's philosophical writings.(30)
This reflects the fact that of all of Leibniz's numerous philosophical works, the *Monadology* is often considered to be of particular importance, due in no small part to the wide range of doctrines discussed therein. But as important as the *Monadology* is for the student of Leibniz, it is also a very condensed piece, and accordingly has gained a reputation as being one of Leibniz's most difficult works. To address this, this volume contains not just the Monadology itself, but also a detailed section-by-section commentary, designed to dispel the clouds of obscurity that hang over the text. The *Monadology* has long been seen as a work that benefits from a commentary: the first commentaries appeared in the nineteenth century,(31) and have since been joined by others.(32) As will become clear, in the commentary I have sought not just to clarify the claims Leibniz makes, but also identify his grounds and reasoning. This involves identifying his assumptions, detailing his arguments, and highlighting his inferences." (*Introduction*, p. 11)
(29) F. H. Hedge, 'The Monadology', *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 1:3 (1867), pp. 129–37.
(30) In addition to LPW, MPE, MPW, PPL, and PE, translations can be found in: *The Philosophical Works of Leibnitz*, 2nd edn, trans. and ed. George Martin Duncan (The Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Company, 1908); *Leibniz Selections*, trans. and ed. Philip P. Wiener (New York: Scribner, 1951); Philosophical Texts, trans. and ed. R. S. Woolhouse and Richard Francks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
(31) Th. Desdouits, *La Monadologie* (Paris: Delalain, 1880); Alexis Bertrand, *La Monadologie* (Paris: Belin, 1886); MPW
(32) For example, Nicholas Rescher, *G. W. Leibniz's Monadology: An Edition for Students* (London: Routledge, 1992).
Abbreviations
LPW = *Philosophical Writings*, trans. and ed. Mary Morris and G. H. R. Parkinson (London: Everyman, 1973).
MPE = *Monadology and Other Philosophical Essays,* trans. and ed. Paul Schrecker and Anne Martin Schrecker (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965).
MPW = *The Monadology and Other Philosophical Writings,* trans. and ed. Robert Latta (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898).
PE = *Philosophical Essays*, trans. Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1989).
PPL = *Philosophical Papers and Letters*, trans. and ed. Leroy Loemker, 2nd edn (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1969).
>

33. Clarke, Samuel. 1717. *A Collection of Papers Which passed between the late Learned Mr. Leibnitz, and Dr. Clarke relating to the Principles of Ntutral Philosophy and Religion. With an Appendix*. London: James Enapton.
Advertisement to the Reader
The reader will be pleased to observe,

1. That the following letters are all printed exactly as they were written, without adding, diminishing, or altering a word. Only the marginal notes and the Appendix were added.
2. That the translation is made with great exactness to prevent any misrepresentation of Leibniz's sense.
3. That the numbers of sections in each of Clarke's letters refer respectively to the numbers or sentences of each of Leibniz's immediately preceding letters.

>

34. Alexander, Henry Gavin, ed. 1956. *The Leibniz-Clarke Correspondence: Together with Extracts from Newton's Principia and Opticks*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Edited with introduction and notes by H. G. Alexander. Reprint: New York: Garland, 1985.
Contents: Preface VII; Abbreviations VIII; Introduction.
I.THE ORIGIN OF THE CORRESPONDENCE
The Newton-Leibniz Controversy, 1705-1716 IX; Samuel Clarke XI; Caroline, Leibniz and Clarke XII;
II. THE ARGUMENT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE
Summary of Argument XIII; Natural Religion XV; Space as the Sensorium of God XV; God's Intervention in the Universe XVI; Gravity XVIII; The Vacuum XX; The Principle of Sufficient Reason XXII; The Principle of the Identity of Indiscernibles XXIII; Space and Time XXV; Measurement of Force XXIX;
III. THE PROBLEM OF SPACE AND TIME
Newton's Theory of Space and Time in the *Principia* XXXIV; The Space-Time Controversy from Leibniz to Kant (Thümmig and Wolff, Berkeley, English critics of Clarke, Voltaire, Maclaurin, Euler, Boscovitch, Kant) XL; Mach and Einstein XLIX;
LIST OF PREVIOUS EDITIONS LV
THE CORRESPONDENCE
Clarke's dedication 5; Leibniz's first paper 11; Clarke's first reply 12; Leibniz's second paper 15; Clarke's second reply 20; Leibniz's third paper 25; Clarke's third reply 30; Leibniz's fourth paper 36; Clarke's fourth reply 45; Leibniz's fifth paper 55; Clarke's fifth reply 97; Clarke's appendix of selected passages from Leibniz 127;
APPENDIX A : EXTRACTS FROM NEWTON'S *PRINCIPIA* AND *OPTICKS* 142;
APPENDIX B : EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS RELATING TO THE CORRESPONDENCE
1. Leibniz and Newton to Conti 184; 2. Leibniz to Wolff and Bernoulli 188; 3. Leibniz's Correspondence with Caroline 189;
INDEX OF NAMES 199.
"The exchange of papers between Leibniz and Clarke is the most frequently cited of all eighteenth-century philosophical controversies. For their contemporaries it was the final confrontation of 'the mathematical philosophy, represented by Newton and his champion Clarke, and the metaphysical philosophy'. To many modern observers it appears to mark one of the final stages in that temporary emancipation of the natural sciences from philosophy and theology, which made possible the progress of science in the two succeeding centuries.
This is the first complete edition in English since 1738. The text follows exactly that of the first edition of 1717 prepared by Clarke himself, except that the spelling has been modernized, italics and capital letters have been removed, and the arrangement of the marginal references and footnotes simplified. The original punctuation has been retained. Clarke's translation of Leibniz's papers is extremely accurate, and editorial comment has been necessary only at a very few points.
Since the Correspondence is chiefly concerned with the wider implications of Newton's physics, we have added an appendix containing those passages in the *Principia* and *Opticks* which are mentioned in the Correspondence, and also the

sections in which Newton expresses his general views on philosophy and scientific method." (*Preface*, p. VII).

>

35. Ariew, Roger, ed. 2000. *G. W. Leibniz and Samuel Clarke: Correspondence*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
Contents: Abbreviations VI; Introduction. Leibniz, Caroline, Newton, and Clarke VII; Editor's Note XIV-XV; Clarke's Introduction. To Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales 1; Advertisement to the Reader 3; The Correspondence. Leibniz's First Letter, Being an Extract of a Letter Written in November, 1715 4; Clarke's First Reply 5; Leibniz's Second Letter, Being an Answer to Clarke's First Reply 7; Clarke's Second Reply 11; Leibniz's Third Letter, Being an Answer to Clarke's Second Reply 14; Clarke's Third Reply 18; Leibniz's Fourth Letter, Being an Answer to Clarke's Third Reply 22; Clarke's Fourth Reply 29; Leibniz's Fifth Letter, Being an Answer to Clarke's Fourth Reply 36; Clarke's Fifth Reply 66; Appendices. A: Passages from Leibniz's Works That May Shed Light on Many Parts of the Previous Letters 88; B: Selections from Newton's Works . 1. *Principia*, Scholium to Definitions 95; 2. *Principia*, General Scholium 101; 3. *Optics*, end of Query 31 105-110.
"The correspondence with Clarke took place during Leibniz's last few years; as such, the doctrines it contains resemble those of the *Theodicy* and "*Monadology*." In the exchange Leibniz is especially concerned to
defend the principle of sufficient reason as the basis for contingent truths, as opposed to the principle of contradiction, which he asserts is the foundation for necessary truths.(16) He also defends a number of his characteristic theses: small perceptions which we do not consciously perceive, preestablished harmony between the soul and the body, and especially the identity of indiscernibles.(17) According to Leibniz, the thesis of the identity of indiscernibles would "put an end to such doctrines as the empty tablets of the soul, a soul without thought, a substance without action, void space, atoms, and even particles in matter not actually divided, complete uniformity in a part of time, place, or matter ... and a thousand other fictions of philosophers which arise from their incomplete notions"(18)-doctrines which he disputed with Newton and Clarke." (*Introduction*, p. XIII)
(16) Principle of sufficient reason: "that nothing is without a sufficient reason why it is, and why it is thus rather than otherwise"; principle of contradiction: "that a proposition cannot be true and false at the same time, and that therefore A is A and cannot be not A." See "Monadology," sec. 31-3, AG 217.
(17) "Two individual things cannot be perfectly alike and must always differ in something over and above number."
(18) AG 297.
References
AG = G. W. Leibniz, *Philosophical Essays*, eds. and trans. Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1989)

>

36. Brown, Gregory, ed. 2023. *The Leibniz–Caroline–Clarke Correspondence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
"The documents gathered in this volume cut a winding path through the tumultuous final thirty-three months of Leibniz's life, from March 1714 to his death on 14 November 1716. The disputes with Newton and his followers over the discovery of the calculus and, later, over the issues in natural philosophy and theology that came to dominate Leibniz's correspondence with Samuel Clarke, certainly loom large in the story of these years. But as the title of this volume is intended to convey, the letters exchanged between Leibniz and Caroline of Brandenburg-Ansbach, Electoral Princess of Braunschweig-Lüneburg and later Princess of Wales, also figure prominently in their telling, and I have included their complete extant correspondence from 1714 to 1716. These letters are of particular interest inasmuch as they provide valuable insights into how and why Leibniz's correspondence with Clarke arose, and why it developed as it did, with Caroline in the role of influential

go-between—whence the title, *The Leibniz–Caroline–Clarke Correspondence*." (*Preface*, p. XXIII)

"All the documents gathered in this volume are arranged chronologically according to the dates on which they were either composed or transmitted. And so although Clarke published his edition of the correspondence between himself and Leibniz in 1717, I have arranged Clarke's papers chronologically according to the dates of the letters by which they were transmitted by Princess Caroline to Leibniz; similarly, I have arranged Leibniz's papers chronologically according to the dates of the letters by which he transmitted them to Caroline for delivery to Clarke.

However, the Dedication and Advertisement to the Reader with which Clarke prefaced his edition of the correspondence, as well as the list of passages from Leibniz's works that he appended to that edition, are here reproduced in the section for the year 1717."(*Preface*, p. XXIV)