

## INTRODUCTION

The first modern editor of Descartes' correspondence was Victor Cousin (1792–1869), in whose general edition in 11 volumes (Paris: Levrault, 1824–1826) the correspondence occupies vols. 6–10. His edition was followed by the edition of Descartes' works by Charles Adam and Paul Tannery, in 12 volumes (vol. 12 containing Descartes' biography by Charles Adam), followed by a *Supplément* (1897–1913). The correspondence occupies vols. 1–5 but there are also letters in other volumes. Although this edition (usually referred to as AT) is as yet the only critical one, it is, as far as the correspondence is concerned, far from satisfactory, among other things because it was made before the publication of Descartes' correspondence with Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687). This correspondence (113 letters to and from Descartes), which almost completely survives in autograph, is carefully dated most of the time and therefore provides a chronological backbone for the correspondence as a whole.<sup>1</sup> For Charles Adam this was a reason to entirely revise his own work and propose a new chronology, first in an article in 1933<sup>2</sup>, then, together with Gérard Milhaud, in a new edition of the correspondence (Descartes, *Correspondance*, 8 vols., Paris: Alcan/PUF, 1936–1963. Reprint. Liechtenstein: Krauss, 1970). But although this edition (known as AM) is in some respects better than AT, it cannot be used without it. For not only is it not critical, it also lacks all annotation.

When in the early sixties of the last century the original edition of AT was sold out and it became difficult to find complete copies of AM (whose publication had been interrupted by the Second World War), AT was reprinted (1964–1974; latest reprint Paris: Vrin, 1996) with at the end of each volume 'nouvelles additions', which most of the time amount to a simple photographic reprint of material as it was published after 1913 (whenever the text was newly set it is full of mistakes). An appendix with critical remarks, often based on the *Correspondance de Mersenne* (ed. Cornelis de Waard, et al., 17 vols., Paris: Beauchesne/PUF/CNRS, 1932–1988) completes each volume (but it is not unusual to find a second appendix in one of the later volumes). Finally, on top of the indices already given in the original, there is a new index of names for the 'nouvelles additions'. Needless to say that the result is unmanageable, especially for those who are not familiar with the history of this edition. But even expert readers easily get lost. For not only is the chronological order of the letters radically broken, the new dates suggested in the appendices are sometimes a source of confusion.

Lack of chronological accuracy may be the most important but is not the only failure of AT. First of all, the editors print as correspondence, for example, a contract (AT I, 1), or the text of a conversation (with Burman, AT V, 146–179).<sup>3</sup> Another peculiarity is the idiosyncratic way AT deal with spelling and grammar,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Correspondence of Descartes and Huygens 1635–1647*, ed. L. Roth (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926).

<sup>2</sup> 'Correspondance de Descartes: nouveau classement', *Revue philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger*, 115 (1933), 373–401.

<sup>3</sup> All references are to the latest reprint of the AT edition in 11 volumes (Paris: Vrin, 1996).

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

which are generally reconstructed and ‘corrected’ on the basis of what is presumed to be Descartes’ authentic spelling (AT I, lxxix–cv). AT usually do not have a clear policy if there is more than one version of the text—and often have it wrong. Finally, AT contains much information which is redundant or erratic or is printed in places where one would not expect it, whereas essential information, on Dutch personalities and events in particular, is often lacking. Indeed, anybody that ever used AT will agree that it needs to be redone completely and fundamentally.<sup>4</sup>

The aim of the present publication is to provide a historical and critical edition of Descartes’ correspondence over 1643, that is, letters and parts of letters as they were actually sent, as well as drafts, copies and written enclosures.<sup>5</sup> Sources can be distinguished in:

1. ‘Autographs’—any letter written and actually sent or meant to be sent by the author.
2. ‘Minutes’—any other manuscript version of a letter made by the author or a secretary (draft letter, copy, neat copy for publication, etc).
3. ‘Copies’—any manuscript version of the letter made without the supervision of the author on the basis of another manuscript version (autograph, other copy) of the same letter.
4. ‘Editions’—any printed version of the letter (critical or non-critical edition, abstract, summary, etc).

The total number of letters is almost 800, c.280 of which are autographs; there are no minutes by Descartes at all (only editions after minutes) and some copies. In most cases it is clear what version of the text should form the basis of the edition. If there is an autograph that is usually the autograph; if there is no autograph but only a minute (or a printed version of the minute) it is the minute; and, if there is neither, it is the copy or edition closest to the autograph. Of course it is there that problems begin. Moreover, if there is, not only an autograph, but also a minute (or a printed version of a minute) or a copy, these should be accounted for in the critical apparatus. In any case, the reader must be confident that the editor has seen all versions of the text that are possibly relevant. That is what we have done most of the time—if for some reason we have not it is carefully indicated.

The relevant editions and printed versions on the other hand—‘relevant’ because they are based on texts that are lost now—mainly date from the 17th century:

---

<sup>4</sup> That it is impossible to rearrange the material as it was originally given becomes clear if one looks at the various digital versions which became available in the past ten years.

<sup>5</sup> Although it is difficult to produce a fully satisfactory definition of ‘letter’ and ‘correspondence’ there can usually be little disagreement about what should or should not be included. Thus, we exclude the *Epistola ad Voetium* (1643), which is a book having the form of a letter and, if the occasion is there, we would also exclude the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (1642) or the ‘Objections and replies’ that have the form of a letter—if only because their natural place (to use that un-Cartesian phrase) would be in an edition of the *Meditationes*.

## Introduction

1. *Lettres de Monsieur Descartes*, 3 vols., Paris: Angot (for the first two volumes Angot and Le Gras), 1657–1667.
2. *Renati Descartes Epistolae*, vols. 1–2, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1668; vol. 3, Amsterdam: Blaeu, 1683.
3. Adrien Baillet, *Vie de Mr Des-Cartes*, 2 vols., Paris: Horthemels, 1691.

In the following we briefly review these sources, after a summary of what we managed to know on the history of Descartes' manuscripts (especially the correspondence) until the end of the 17th century.

### *The Leiden Suitcase*

Before leaving the Low Countries in the autumn of 1649, Descartes entrusted his Leiden friend Cornelis van Hogelande (1590–1662) with a suitcase ('coffre' or 'malle') containing letters and papers.<sup>6</sup> In an accompanying letter, which survives only in Baillet, Descartes explains:

... there is nothing secret in any of the letters I left in the suitcase. Even so, there may be a chance that in some of them there are things the people who wrote them might not want to be read by anybody, so I believe the best would be to burn them all, except those of Voetius to Father Mersenne, which you will find inserted in the lid and which I want to be preserved as a protection against his calumnies. You may read all the others or have them read by discrete friends before burning them or indeed burn only those you find fit, for I leave all that to your discretion.<sup>7</sup>

But if one reads Baillet's report carefully it becomes clear that the suitcase contained a second letter to Van Hogelande, dated like the other 30 August 1649:

In another letter, *which he had locked in the suitcase* [Descartes] told [Van Hogelande] that he had not made a will, so as not to give rise to disputes, but left his heirs whatever they could find in France to belong to him. From this he excepted only three annuities, which he had transported to the abbé Picot two years earlier and which therefore were no longer his.<sup>8</sup> He specifically left them the estate of his maternal uncle, who died one year earlier, but denied that they could raise any claim in Holland, where, so he said, he did not leave anything worth a penny.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> 'Il disposa deux coffres de ses hardes et de ses papiers pour la Suede; et du reste il fit une malle, qu'il envoya en dépôt à Leyde chez M. de Hooghelande avec une lettre du 30. Août, pour le prier de faire ouvrir la malle en sa présence et en celle de M. de Berghen, aux premieres nouvelles certaines qu'il recevrait de sa mort'. Baillet II, 386. 'M. de Berghen' is Anthony Studler van Zurck, Lord of Bergen (see below).

<sup>7</sup> Descartes to Van Hogelande, 30 August 1649, AT V, 410 (Baillet, I, xxviii–xxix).

<sup>8</sup> This had been settled in Rennes on 26 July 1647 in the presence of Descartes, his family and Picot; cf. Baillet, II, 325 (AT V, 66–67). See also Descartes to Picot, 30 August 1649, AT V, 406, 409.

<sup>9</sup> 'Il luy marquoit dans une autre lettre qu'il avoit enfermée dans la malle, qu'il n'avoit pas voulu faire de testament, pour ne donner lieu à aucune dispute; mais qu'il laissoit à ses héritiers tout ce

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

So Descartes' suitcase contained in any case: 1) a letter to Van Hogelande of 30 August 1649, which took the place of a will and completed the instructions already given in Descartes' separate letter to Van Hogelande of the same date; 2) letters to Descartes; 3) letters of Voetius to Mersenne.

One can be brief on the letters of Voetius to Mersenne. Descartes obtained five letters from Mersenne. He sent copies to the Utrecht *Vroedschap* in June 1645, alleging they were slanderous and confirmed the points he, Descartes, made about Voetius in *Epistola ad Voetium* (1643).<sup>10</sup> One of these letters is quoted in a letter to the French Ambassador (1644), a second in the *Lettre apologétique* (1647) and that is all we know about them.<sup>11</sup>

With respect to Descartes' own correspondence the question is whether Van Hogelande really burned it. Baillet is suspicious. Quoting a letter of the theologian Van Limborch (1633–1712) he suggests that Van Hogelande consulted Johannes de Raey (1622–1702). Moreover, he accuses De Raey of having kept things for himself—which De Raey in turn denied claiming that 'the papers in the suitcase were few in number and of little interest because Descartes had taken the more important ones with him to Sweden'.<sup>12</sup> That not all letters were burned is in fact certain. According to a note on the envelope that covered Descartes' correspondence with Huygens when it turned up for auction at the beginning of the 19th century Huygens' letters were restituted to their author by Van Hogelande on 21 July 1650<sup>13</sup>—so presumably they had been in the suitcase. Although it is reasonable to suppose that Van Hogelande dealt with all letters in the same way there is no certainty.

Finally, what can be said of the letters to Van Hogelande? In fact, what is most intriguing about them is that they were known to Baillet—despite the fact that by 1690 Van Hogelande had already been dead for thirty years and that they were not published by Clerselier. So what happened presumably on 4 March

---

qu'ils pourroient trouver en France qui luy appartenoit. Il en exceptoit seulement trois contrats de constitution de rente, qu'il avoit transportés à l'Abbé Picot depuis deux ans, et qui pour cette raison ne luy appartenoient plus. Il leur abandonnoit nommément la succession de son oncle maternel mort depuis un an: mais il leur fit dire qu'ils n'avoient rien à prétendre de luy dans toute la Hollande, leur declarant qu'il n'y laissoit rien qui fût à luy de la valeur d'un teston', Baillet, II, 386 (this letter is not mentioned or published in AT). The 'maternal uncle' is René Brochard, sieur des Fontaines, who died in August 1648: 'N'ayant point laissé d'enfans, M. Descartes, par un accord fait avec M. de la Bretaillière [Descartes' eldest brother] et M. du Crevis [his brother in law] recueillit seul sa succession, qui n'auroit pas été médiocre si M. des Fontaines n'eût pas fait une donation de tous ses acquêts et de tous ses meubles aux enfans de sa femme et à sa femme même. Ce qui absorba tellement son bien, que les héritiers de nôtre Philosophe, qui ne vécût que dix-huit mois depuis, n'y trouverent presque rien a sa mort'. Baillet, II, 348; cf. II, p. 461.

<sup>10</sup> Descartes to Huygens, 4 August 1645, AT IV, 261 (781); cf. Kernkamp, I, 219.

<sup>11</sup> Descartes to La Thuillerie, 22 January 1644, AT IV, 88 (Voetius' letter probably dates from April 1642, cf. E.-J. Bos, 'Epistolarium Voetianum II', *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis*, 79 (1999), 39–73, esp. p. 73); *Lettre apologétique*, AT VIII B, 205–206/CM X, 164. Two other letters to Mersenne, which survive in autograph and date from 1639/1640, were presumably not forwarded to Descartes (CM VIII, 433–435; IX, 69–72). Cf. E.-J. Bos, 'Epistolarium Voetianum I', *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis*, 78 (1998), 184–198. Voetius confirmed that Descartes showed his letters to Mersenne to various dignitaries in The Hague in 1644/1645, see 'Epistolarium Voetianum II'.

<sup>12</sup> Baillet, I, xxviii–xxix.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Correspondence*, ed. Roth, p. xxxv (not in AT). The envelope is now lost; cf. p. xlv.

## Introduction

1650, when the suitcase was opened, is that an official report (signed by a notary and three witnesses—see below) was made, which together with an authorized copy of the letters to Van Hogelande was sent to Descartes' legitimate heirs: his elder brother Pierre Descartes de La Bretallière (1591–1660) and his half-brother Joachim Descartes de Chavagnes (c.1602–1680), whose children in turn, Joachim Descartes de Kerlau (1627–1700), the eldest son of Pierre, or Joachim Descartes de Chavagnes (1635–1718), the eldest son of Joachim, gave or showed all those documents to Baillet.<sup>14</sup>

Again, Descartes' suitcase was opened on 4 March 1650. This was done at the request of Anthony Studler van Zurck (c.1608–1666), whom, according to Baillet, Descartes owed a considerable sum of money—9,000 pounds in Dutch money, that is, more than 10,500 pounds in French money.<sup>15</sup> Given this debt Van Zurck may have had a claim on the contents of the suitcase but in any case Descartes had explicitly asked Van Hogelande to have it opened in his presence.<sup>16</sup> According to Baillet this was done before a Leiden notary, François Doude (c.1617–1664), and three witnesses: Louis de la Voyette (described as a 'gentilhomme français'—which means that Baillet knows absolutely nothing about him), Johannes de Raey and Frans van Schooten.<sup>17</sup> La Voyette was a member of the Walloon Church (so he was francophone and presumably of French extraction) and an officer in the States' Army. He was born in the garrison town of Heusden (Brabant), so presumably his father was also an officer. He was a friend of Huygens and in 1650 participated in a burlesque poetic exchange on Scarron (1610–1660), which also involved Charles d'Aumale de Haucourt, a French infantry colonel who was also in Dutch service.<sup>18</sup> He later went into

<sup>14</sup> On Descartes' brothers and nephews see Frédéric Saulnier, *Le Parlement de Bretagne 1554–1790, Répertoire alphabétique et biographique de tous les membres de la Cour*, 2 vols., Mayenne: Imprimerie de la Manutention, 1991 (Rennes: Plihon/Hommay, 1909), vol. 1, pp. 297–298.

<sup>15</sup> Descartes to Picot, 30 August 1649, AT V, 407. It is impossible to say what those sums amount to in modern figures; indeed, the notion of 'pound' (as a monetary unit) was little used in the Netherlands. If 'pound' stands for 'guilder' the indicated sum would be the equivalent of nine years' salary of a university professor (or twenty years' salary of a preacher).

<sup>16</sup> Baillet, II, 386. It is not clear how Descartes had settled his accounts with Van Zurck. Apparently there were two annuities, together amounting to 10,400 pounds (AT V, 407, l. 27) in French money. Both had been transported earlier to Picot. Moreover one of those, of a nominal value of 4,000 pounds (407, l. 16), had been released by Descartes paying 4,800 pounds (the sum with interest) to Picot's procurator, Claude du Bouexic de la Chapelle, who however had lent most of that money to friends. So Picot, 'par l'amitié qui est entre nous', is asked to sell it and send it to Van Zurck. All this seems to have been laid down in a document deposited with a notary but so far we have found no trace of that.

<sup>17</sup> Baillet, II, 429; cf. I, xxviii. François Doude was also the notary before whom Descartes appointed Jacques Bouexic de la Villeneuve (1590–1658) as his procurator in the succession of his father. Witnesses here were Studler van Zurck and Van Hogelande; cf. Gustave Cohen, *Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris/The Hague: Champion/Nijhoff, 1921), pp. 526–527. In 1644 Doude furthermore registered a marriage contract between Helena Jansdr van der Strom, the mother of Descartes' daughter Francine, and Jan van Wel, an inhabitant of Egmond, which contract Descartes signed as a witness. See J. van de Ven, 'Données nouvelles sur Helena Jans', in *Bulletin cartésien*, 2004 (forthcoming).

<sup>18</sup> He is mentioned in a letter of Huygens to the Count of Dohna of 24 July 1653: 'Monsieur de la Voyette trouvera icy s'il vous plait les assurances reciproques de la parfaite estime que je fais de son merite et de son amitié'. *Briefwisseling*, V, 181. For the poems concerning Scarron (also that by La Voyette) see Huygens, *Gedichten* IV, 209–214 (also <http://www.etcl.nl/huygens/>).

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

Swedish service and died in combat in 1659. Frans van Schooten is not the father (as Baillet believes), for he died in 1645, but the son (1615–1660), who translated Descartes' *Géométrie* into Latin and illustrated most of his works. He did have a few Cartesian papers and documents, which almost certainly came from Descartes himself—among them a copy of the *Compendium musicae*.<sup>19</sup> The only witness still alive when Baillet wrote his biography was Johannes de Raey. In 1650 he was a young doctor in medicine and a master in philosophy, who like other young doctors without a position earned a living presumably by tutoring students. He knew Descartes personally and possessed a copy of Descartes' exchange with Le Conte on the *Principia* but refused all co-operation with the French.<sup>20</sup> The fact finally that it was Van Hogelande who returned Huygens' letters to their author suggests that he was given the authority to act as executor. So if any of the papers in the Leiden suitcase were dispersed or destroyed, it was by Van Hogelande.

The Leiden suitcase re-emerges briefly in 1691. Baillet engaged his friend the abbé Claude Nicaise (1623–1701) to ask his Dutch correspondents for information on Descartes' life and letters. Although this intervention (which to a large extent can be reconstructed from independent sources—see below) gave Baillet the disposal of a number of printed sources, it probably produced no new correspondence. Still, in February 1691 (when Baillet's *Life of Descartes* is already being printed) there is some intriguing information in a letter of Jean Le Clerc (1657–1736) to Nicaise:

I learned that one could find letters and papers on this famous philosopher [Descartes] in Alkmaar (a town in North-Holland) in the house of a nobleman who used to be one of his friends. If it were not winter I would go there myself to find out.<sup>21</sup>

The identity of 'Descartes' friend' is revealed in the next letter, written the 1<sup>st</sup> of May:

I would be glad to contribute something either to the Life of Descartes or to the knowledge of his correspondence but there does not seem to be any chance. The gentleman who at the request of an important person had offered to let someone search a suitcase with papers of Descartes, and who is called Mr. van Bergen ('Mr de Bergue'), has taken offence because in Paris his offers were received in an uncivil manner, so there is no chance of obtaining anything from him.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> The Van Schooten collection is now in the manuscript department of Groningen University Library.

<sup>20</sup> Baillet, 'préface,' xxxi–xxxii. He possessed Descartes' exchange with Le Conte (AT IV, 475–485), which by that time however was already published.

<sup>21</sup> 'J'ai appris que l'on pourroit trouver à Alkmaar, qui est une ville de Northollande, diverses lettres et papiers concernant cet illustre Philosophe [Descartes], chez un Gentil-homme qui a été de ses amis. Si nous n'étions pas en hiver, j'y serois peut être allé, pour découvrir ce que c'est', Jean Le Clerc to Nicaise, 8 February 1691, in: Jean Le Clerc, *Epistolario*, ed. Sina, 4 vols. (Florence: Olschki, 1987–1992), vol. 2, p. 48.

<sup>22</sup> 'Je voudrais bien contribuer quelque chose ou à la vie de Descartes, ou à l'augmentation de ses

## Introduction

The ‘Mr de Bergue’ Le Clerc has in mind is undoubtedly Anthony Studler van Zurck, who in 1642 became ‘Lord of Sweijland and Bergen’. He was a friend of Descartes and, as we already saw, was present at the opening of the ‘Leiden suitcase’. However, he died in 1666, so in 1691 the Lord of Bergen must have been, either his eldest son Adriaan, or his second son Antonis—indeed, Adriaan died that very year (precise date unknown) without leaving any children and the title and the estate passed to his brother. An inventory was made on 30 June 1692 in the presence of the Alkmaar notary Cornelis Heijmenbergh, which in fact mentions a bag or envelope with ‘papers of Mr Descartes’.<sup>23</sup> It is not clear what those papers are. What we do know is that Van Zurck (the father) possessed a copy of Descartes’ *Traité de l’homme* (acquired around 1641).<sup>24</sup> He may have had other texts as well—but nothing is certain. From Antonis the estate went to his only daughter, Susanna Cornelia, who, born in Alkmaar on 4 June 1685, married Lodewijk Adriaan van Nassau-Woudenberg (1670–1742).<sup>25</sup> This does not necessarily mean that the Descartes papers, if by that time they were still there, came into the possession of the Nassau family. Indeed, the ‘Bergen’ part of the estate (the ‘Bergense boedel’) was put under a trust that was lifted only in 1815.<sup>26</sup> What remained after liquidation went (by their mother Anna Petronella, countess of Nassau) to Jacob-Adriaan, Willem-Jan and Frederik-Christiaan Mulert van de Leemcule.<sup>27</sup> It is from there that all traces are lost.

In sum it is almost certain that, apart from the letters of Huygens to Descartes and the letters of Descartes to Van Hogelande, there is no letter of which one can be confident that it goes back to the ‘Leiden suitcase’—although obviously there are a few (Regius’ letters to Descartes) of which this may be presumed.<sup>28</sup> But there was yet another suitcase, the one Descartes took with him to Sweden, which after his death came into the possession of Hector-Pierre Chanut (1600–1662), the French ambassador in Sweden.

---

lettres, mais il n’y a pas d’apparence. Celui qui avoit offert à la priere d’une personne de considération, de laisser fouiller dans un coffre où il y a quelques papiers de Descartes, et qui se nomme Mr de Bergue, s’est choqué de ce que l’on a reçu à Paris ses offres d’une manière très-desobligeante, de sorte qu’il n’y a plus d’apparence de rien obtenir de lui’. Le Clerc to Nicaise, 1 May 1691, *Epistolario*, vol. 2, p. 53.

<sup>23</sup> Regionaal Archief Alkmaar, Notarieel Archief, vol. 211, no. 101, sq. The existence of this document was first signalled in a note in *De Navorscher*, 96 (1953/54), pp. 43–44.

<sup>24</sup> Van Zurck’s text was used for the Latin translation of the *Traité de l’homme*, published in 1662 by Florentius Schuyt: ‘Pudori meo deinde succurrit et ad Opusculum absolvendum atque in lucem edendum impulit Authoritas Viri [?] Anthonius Stutler van Surck [?] qui nativa sua benevolentia Ectypum a sese ex Authoris nostri Autographo quam accuratissime delineatum in hunc finem mihi lubens concessit’, ‘Ad lectorem’, AT XI, vii. One may deduce from this that Van Zurck is one of the persons alluded to by Descartes in his letter to Mersenne of 23 November 1646, AT IV, 566–567/CM XIV, 624.

<sup>25</sup> Lodewijk-Adriaan came from a bastard branch of the Orange family, his great-grandfather being Maurits of Nassau (1567–1625) and his great-grandmother the Roman Catholic Margaretha van Mechelen (1580–1662). She gave Maurits three sons: Willem, Lodewijk (Lodewijk-Adriaan’s grandfather) and Maurits, who were the only ‘official’ bastards (Maurits had eight natural children with five different wives).

<sup>26</sup> The reason for this trust may have been the debts caused by the gambling habits of Lodewijk-Adriaan’s father, Willem-Adriaan van Nassau-Odijk (1632–1705).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Nederlands Adelsboek*, 42 (1949), p. 187.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Bos, xx–xxii.

*Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

*The Stockholm Inventory*

According to Baillet Descartes sorted out his papers after Queen Christina asked him to ‘establish some order among his unpublished writings’. But, allegedly, Descartes found nothing finished or publishable.<sup>29</sup> Still, after Descartes’ death papers and letters were found which, after an inventory was made almost immediately, would come into the possession of Chanut, who in turn sent them to Clerselier (1614–1684).<sup>30</sup> After a much troubled journey, involving a shipwreck and ignorant servants, the papers arrived in Paris in 1653, where they came to form the basis of editions, not only of Descartes’ correspondence, but also of several posthumous works.<sup>31</sup>

A few things do not match. First of all, if one reads Baillet’s report carefully it emerges that Descartes’ goods were inventoried on two occasions:

The day after the funeral, which was on 13 February, the Queen of Sweden (at the request of the Ambassador who did not like making an inventory of the goods that had belonged to the deceased on his own and was even less inclined to let the Officers of Justice work on it in his House) sent the First Gentleman of Her Chamber to be present on behalf of Her Majesty. That was Erric Sparre, Baron of Croneberg, Lord of Haffnenne and Dudderae and President of the Court of Justice in Abo in Finland. Present at that inventory were also Father Viogué, Mr. Picques and Henry Schlüter, the deceased’s valet.<sup>32</sup>

Again, the fact that Baillet knows those details no less than the erratic way in which he spells the names of the officials involved may be the most important aspect of this story—indeed it suggests that he has seen an official act or report which was sent to Descartes’ legitimate heirs.<sup>33</sup> Apparently, though, the conclusion of this first inventory was that there was nothing of value.<sup>34</sup> Next day there was another inspection:

Next day an inspection was made of the trunk, the papers and the writings of the deceased. The few books which *the inventory of the*

---

<sup>29</sup> Baillet, II, 397.

<sup>30</sup> Baillet, I, x–xi.

<sup>31</sup> Baillet, II, 428; cf. II, 402.

<sup>32</sup> ‘Le jour d’après les funérailles, qui étoit le treizième de Février, la reine de Suède, à la prière de M. l’Ambassadeur, qui n’étoit pas bien aise que l’Inventaire des choses qui avoient appartenu au défunt se fist par luy seul, et moins encore que les Officiers de justice y travaillassent dans son hôtel, envoya le premier Gentil-Homme de sa Chambre, pour y estre présent au nom de sa Majesté. C’étoit le Sieur Erric Sparre Baron de Croneberg, Seigneur de Haffnenne Président de la Cour de Justice d’Abo en Finlande. Les personnes qui assistèrent à cet Inventaire outre l’Ambassadeur de France et ce Seigneur Suédois, furent le Père Viogué, M. Picques, et Henry Schlüter valet de chambre du défunt’. Baillet, II, 427 (AT X, 1). François Viogué was chaplain to the French embassy and assisted Descartes in his last hours. He is the author of an attest and a memoir on Descartes’ religious feelings (Baillet, II, 548–552). Picques was secretary of the embassy.

<sup>33</sup> ‘Seigneur de Haffnenne’ is obviously the mangled version of ‘D(ux) Haffniensis’ (Duke of Copenhagen)—Baillet has read ‘D’ as ‘Dominus’. The person referred to may be Ture Eriksson Sparre (1593–1664), who was Lord of Croneberg since 1647. Cf. *Svenskt biografiskt handlexicon*, vol. II, p. 490.

<sup>34</sup> Baillet, II, 428.

## Introduction

*day before* had brought to light, as well as family papers, were put aside for his heirs. But the scientific writings were taken care of by the Ambassador. He took his time to examine them at ease and since *the proprietary rights had been handed over to him by whoever enjoyed them*, he gave them to Mr. Clerselier, his brother-in-law.<sup>35</sup>

So before Chanut went about to examine Descartes' papers there already was an inventory, which cannot be our 'Stockholm Inventory'—indeed, it must rather be the one Baillet refers to as 'Inventaire de Monsieur Descartes'.<sup>36</sup> In any case, the 'Stockholm Inventory' was not part of an official inquest—if it was made in Stockholm at all it was after the first inventory. The fact that Chanut kept Descartes' papers 'to examine them at ease' also makes it unlikely that the 'Stockholm Inventory' was made immediately—Chanut would probably need more than one evening to judge that a manuscript of sixty-nine leaves, 'dont la suite est interrompue en plusieurs endroits,' contains 'la doctrine de ses Principes en françois et non entierement conformes à l'imprimé latin'.<sup>37</sup> We may safely conclude therefore that the 'Inventaire de Stockholm' was made quite a bit later.

Chanut's first intention was to make a small publication of Descartes' correspondence with Queen Christina, Princess Elizabeth and himself—a plan which to a certain extent was also entertained by Descartes himself, possibly at the instigation of Chanut.<sup>38</sup> This becomes clear from Chanut's letters to Princess Elizabeth. The first is of 19 February 1650:

Since [Descartes] did me the honour to live under my roof I was obliged to take care of what he left and have an inventory made of whatever was found in his luggage. Amongst his papers there were quite some letters Your Highness honoured him with, which were very dear to him indeed—as is seen from the fact that they were carefully locked away with his most important papers. I have put them aside and taken them from the suitcase *without including them in the inventory*. I am in no doubt, Madam, that your reputation will be enhanced if it is known that you had learned conversations with the greatest man since many centuries. Indeed, I learned from Mr Descartes that your letters were so full of your enlightened spirit that they would honour you if generally known. Nonetheless I think I owe it to my respect for Your Royal Highness and to my loyalty towards my friend not to read them, nor to allow them to fall into foreign hands without Your Royal Highness's permission, which I await, together with the orders I beg Her to honour me with.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>35</sup> 'Le lendemain se fit la visite du coffre, des papiers et des écrits du défunt. Le peu de livres qui s'étoient trouvez par l'*Inventaire de la veille*, et les papiers concernant les affaires domestiques, furent mis à l'écart, pour être rendus à ses héritiers. Mais pour les écrits concernant les sciences, M. l'Ambassadeur les prit sous sa protection particulière. Il les repassa à son plaisir; *et la propriété luy en ayant été abandonnée par ceux à qui elle pouvoit appartenir*, il en fit un présent quelque têmes après à M. Clerselier son beau-frère' Baillet, II, 428 (AT X, 1).

<sup>36</sup> Baillet, II, 156, 315, 317, 349, 458, 461.

<sup>37</sup> AT X, 12 (X); see also items B, C, D, etc.

<sup>38</sup> Descartes to Elizabeth [31 March 1649], AT V, 331; cf. Descartes to Chanut, 20 November 1647, AT V, 86.

<sup>39</sup> 'Entre ses [Descartes'] papiers, il s'est rencontré quantité de lettres que votre Altesse Royale luy

*Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

But apparently the Princess refused for in a second letter Chanut writes:

I obey the order Your Royal Highness was pleased to give me and I put into the hands of His Excellency the Ambassador of Brandenburg this package, in which I enclose all the letters of Your Royal Highness that were found among the late Mr. Descartes' papers, in the same confused order in which they were found and without allowing myself to see or touch them except to fold them in such a way that they could easily be packed.<sup>40</sup>

Chanut goes on to explain that he regrets the lost opportunity and hopes that Elizabeth will change her mind, especially because Descartes' letters to her, of which 'he is sure to find the minutes among Descartes' papers', are not really intelligible without her part of the correspondence—a covert threat undoubtedly. Indeed, that Chanut really did not 'see nor touch' any of the letters of Elizabeth appears to be in conflict with the fact that we do have a manuscript copy of Elizabeth's letters.<sup>41</sup> That much is certain: 1) Descartes took Elizabeth's letters with him to Sweden; 2) the original letters were given back to Elizabeth.

After representing France in Sweden Chanut became ambassador in Lübeck and, in 1653, in The Hague.<sup>42</sup> A letter of Constantijn Huygens to Princess Elizabeth of 31 December 1653 contains some details:

Mr. Chanut, who has all the papers of the deceased and wants to publish a selection of his letters, wishes to go over it with my Archimedes, to see whether there still is something philosophical or mathematical that could be given to the public. In my opinion anything written by that marvellous hand deserves it.<sup>43</sup>

'My Archimedes' is Constantijn's second son Christiaan (1629–1695), the famous physicist and mathematician, of whom earlier in his letter Huygens had

---

a fait l'honneur de luy escrire, qu'il tenoit bien precieuses, quelques unes estant soigneusement serrées avec ses plus importans papiers. Je les ay toutes mises a part, et les ay tirées du coffre sans les comprendre dans l'inventaire. Je ne doute point, Madame, qu'il ne fust avantageux a vostre reputation que l'on connust que vous avéz eu des entretiens serieux et sçavans avec le plus habile homme qui ayt vescu depuis plusieurs siecles; et j'ay sceu de Monsieur Descartes mesme que vos lettres estoient si plaines de lumiere et d'esprit, qu'il ne vous peut estre que glorieux qu'elles soient veues. Et neantmoins j'ay pensé qu'il estoit de mon respect envers votre Altesse Royale, et de ma fidélité envers mon amy defunct, de n'en lire aucune, et ne permettre pas qu'elles tombent entre les mains de qui que ce soit, que par l'ordre et la permission de Vostre Altesse Royale, que j'attendray avec ses commandemens, dont je la supplie tres humblement de m'honorer'. Chanut to Elizabeth, 19 February 1650, AT V, 471. This letter was first published by Count Boulay de la Meurthe, 'Monuments funéraires de Descartes', *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Touraine*, 23 (1873), 37–42.

<sup>40</sup> Chanut to Elizabeth, 16 April 1650, AT V, 472.

<sup>41</sup> See below, p. xxxiiff, esp. p. xxxv.

<sup>42</sup> There was a short visit in July; cf. Huygens to Dohna, 24 July 1653, *Briefwisseling*, V, 181.

<sup>43</sup> 'Monsieur Chanut, qui possede tous les papiers du defunct et pretend d'en faire imprimer quelques lettres d'eslite, desire feuilleter le tout avecq mondit Archimede, pour voir ce qu'il y a encor de philosophique ou de mathématique dont on pourroit faire part au public, n'(y) ayant point de brouillon de ceste merveilleuse main, à mon advis, qui ne le merite', Huygens to Elizabeth, 31 December 1653, *Briefwisseling*, V, 194 (quoted AT X, 3).

## Introduction

said that Descartes ‘le chérissait d’une affection tres-ardente’.<sup>44</sup> So by the very end of 1653 Christiaan is still helping Chanut to sort out the papers—which if there already were an inventory would be inexplicable. Moreover, the papers and letters were still in Chanut’s possession and were as yet not sent to Paris.

Some additional information can be found in a correspondence of Andreas Colvius (1594–1671), a Walloon minister and a correspondent of Descartes, with his cousin Johan de Witt (1625–1672), the famous ‘raadpensionaris’ (secretary of state) of Holland.<sup>45</sup> To a letter of 29 December 1653, Colvius added the following postscript: ‘I am told that the Ambassador Chanut has the manuscripts of Mr. de Cartes, which I am sure deserve to be seen by all: a word of you could encourage him’.<sup>46</sup> On 3 January 1654 De Witt writes back:

I talked with the ambassador, Mr. Chanut, on the works of Mr. de Cartes and his manuscripts, which as you write are in his possession. And this gentleman told me that several letters of Mr. Descartes to various learned people on diverse matters are already being printed. Also that those manuscripts are nothing but fragments on all sorts of matters, which could never be published before being sifted and ordered.<sup>47</sup>

So, apparently, Chanut has already disposed of some letters but is still working on ‘fragments’. In reaction Colvius offers some of the letters still in his possession:

Since I understand that Mr. Chanut will publish letters of Mr. des Cartes I have searched among mine to see whether they are worth the trouble. They are not the only ones I have of Descartes but since I judge that those others contain personal controversy I believe they are better left out.<sup>48</sup> In case you and the ambassador believe that these letters should be published, you are free to do so. I would wish, though,

---

<sup>44</sup> Huygens, *Briefwisseling*, V, 193.

<sup>45</sup> The correspondence (that is, the letters written by Colvius and the minutes of the letters of De Witt) is in the Nationaal Archief in The Hague (the letters of De Witt as they were copied by a secretary and sent to Colvius are in Leiden University Library). They were published in C.L. Thijssen-Schoute, ‘Andreas Colvius: een correspondent van Descartes’, in: *Uit de Republiek der letteren* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1967), pp. 67–89.

<sup>46</sup> ‘L’on m’a dit que Mr. l’Ambassadeur Chanut a entre ces mains les manuscrits de Mr. de Cartes. Lesquels meritent sans doubte de voir la lumière. Un mot de vostre bouche le pourroit animer à cela’.

<sup>47</sup> ‘Ick hebbe met den Heere Ambassadeur Chanut discours gehadt over de wercken van Mr. de Cartes ende desselfs manu scripta, die U.E. schrijft dat onder syn Ed. berustende waeren, waerop den selven Heere mij te kennen gaf, dat albereijts eenige brieven bij Mr. de Cartes aen verscheiden geleerde persoonagien gesonden ende diversche materien verhandelende onder de persse sijn, dan dat de vordere manu scripta niet en sijn als eenige fragmenta confusselijck van alderhande saecken tracterende, die niet bequameyck int’ licht gegeven cunnen werden, sonder vooraf in een goede ordre gebracht te sijn’. This letter was earlier published in French translation by François Combes, in ‘Correspondance française du grand pensionnaire Jean de Witt’, *Mélanges historiques* (Paris, 1873).

<sup>48</sup> Possibly the letters of 20 April 1643 (Letter 15) and of 5 July 1643 (Letter 34), which deal with Descartes’ controversy with Voetius (which Colvius deplored).

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

that you send them back given the fact that learned manuscripts take no small place in my collection.<sup>49</sup>

But his offer is turned down on 16 January:

As far as those letters are concerned I have examined and read them and would certainly have spoken of them with the ambassador Mr. Chanut, had I not understood that the only letters His Excellency is going to publish are those which Monsieur des Cartes kept with him and, when still alive, arranged in such a way that it is fairly clear that he intended to publish them at some time, but not any of the other letters or works. So if it were the intention of Mr. Descartes that the letters written to you would also be published then His Excellency would already have included them. If however they were not, than Mr. Chanut is undoubtedly not prepared to publish them at all, this being against the presumed intention and will of the deceased. I am confident that none of the letters written to you are among those published now, except perhaps the one on purple rain, for I don't find anything in them that is of sufficient weight and importance to be published as a writing of the said deceased. Accordingly I send them back as your excellency requires.<sup>50</sup>

Again, although much is wanting, these letters contain remarkable information. First of all, they confirm that Chanut is still travelling with Descartes' papers—he has Descartes' manuscripts 'entre ses mains'. It is also clear that Chanut has made up his mind about the letters—indeed, according to De Witt

---

<sup>49</sup> 'Alsoo verstaen dat d'Heer Chanut, eenige brieven in het licht sal brengen van Mr. des Cartes; soo hebbe opgesocht onder de mijne die mij dachte dat eenige matiere inhielden. Ich hebbe wel meer andere van voornoemde de Cartes: maer die oordele, alsoo eenige *personalia eristica* tracteren, dat beter gesupprimeert sijn. Ingevallen dat U.Ed. ende voornoemde Heer Ambassadeur oordeelen dat dese bijgaende brieven het licht soude mede mogen aenschouwen, stelle t'selve aen U.Ed. goetvinden. Wenste oock wel dat de principaelen oock wederom mij mochten behandicht werden: Alsoo geleerde luijden manuscripta in *gazophylacio meo* geen cleijne plaetse bewaren'. Colvius had a great collection of books and manuscripts.

<sup>50</sup> 'Aengaende de voors. brieven, hebbe ick deselve gevisiteerd ende doorlesen, ende soude daerover met den Heere Ambassadeur Chanut gesproocken hebben, ten waere ick wt deselve hadde verstaen dat syn Excellentie geene brieven van Monsieur des Cartes hadde doen in't licht geven als die denselven Monsieur des Cartes onder hem gelaeten, ende in sijn leven soodaenich bij den anderen gevoecht hadde, dat daeruijt wel affgenomen conde werden dat sijne intentie was geweest die t'eenigen tijde t'licht te laeten sien, sonder eenige andere brieven ofte geschriften daer bij gevoecht te hebben; weshalven, bij soo verre meergenoemde Monsieur des Cartes van intentie is geweest dat de voors. brieven aen U.E. geschreven ofte eenigen vandien, mede t'eenigen tijde int' licht souden werden gebracht, soo sal sijn E. deselve mede nevens voorgeroerde andere brieven hebben gevoecht, edoch in cas deselve daeronder niet en werden bevonden, soo soude den Heere Chanut ontwijfelijk geene genegentheijt hebben omme die, buyten de gepresumeerde intentie ende wille vanden overleden, nevens d'anderen door den druck int' licht te brengen. Ende vertrouwe ick vastelijck dat geene van de voors. brieven aen U.E. ges[onden] onder 't getal van die gene die nu int' licht staen te comen, bevonden sullen worden, ten waere alleenlijck die gene vanden purpuren regen is spreekende als niet vindende inde selve eenige materie ofte substantie waerdich omme als een schrift van den voorn. overleden int' licht te werden gebracht ende gaen oversulx de voors. brieven oock hiernevens, volgende U.E. ordre, weder te rugge'. This document allows to identify the addressee of Descartes' letter of [5 October 1646], AT IV, 516–519; cf. C. Louise Thijssen-Schoute, *Nederlands cartesianisme* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1954), pp. 569–572.

## Introduction

some are already ‘being printed’ (*onder de persse*). Furthermore, Chanut’s edition would include those letters only which Descartes prepared for publication—one may think of, for example, the exchanges with Plemp, Fromondus, Morin and others concerning the *Discours* and indeed the correspondence with Princess Elizabeth.<sup>51</sup> Finally, the ‘manuscripts’ (as distinguished from the letters) are still in a state of confusion—indeed, we already know that Chanut wants the help of Christiaan Huygens to sort them out.

All this confirms that the ‘Stockholm inventory’ cannot date from 1650. In fact, it is likely that it was made in The Hague, with the help of Christiaan Huygens, somewhere at the end of 1653 or the beginning of 1654, that is, almost four years after Descartes’ papers came into Chanut’s possession.

### *Lettres de Monsieur Descartes (1657–1667)*

There is no meeting between Clerselier and Descartes on record before the summer of 1644, when, during Descartes’ visit to France, Clerselier told him that he had translated the *Meditations*.<sup>52</sup> The correspondence that followed shows that Clerselier developed a great enthusiasm for Descartes’ philosophy and a great attachment to his person. Despite the fact that it was seen as a *mésalliance* he married off one of his daughters to Jacques Rohault (c.1618–1672), one of France’s leading Cartesians. After Descartes’ death Clerselier spared neither time nor money to honour his memory. Thus he provided editions, not only of Descartes’ correspondence, but also of *Le monde* (1677) and *Traité de l’homme* (1664). Finally, he let Leibniz (1646–1716) and Tschirnhaus (1651–1708) make copies of unpublished material, including the *Regulae ad directionem ingenii* and the *Recherche de la vérité*.<sup>53</sup> Realizing the inadequacy of his efforts he approached a Dutch publisher—apparently, the French publishers were no longer interested—to produce another volume but his death in 1684 made that impossible.<sup>54</sup>

As far as the edition of the letters is concerned, it would be important to know when exactly Clerselier came into the possession of the Chanut collection. On that point the evidence already reviewed can be completed with a letter of Clerselier to Tobias Andreae (1604–1676)—also a friend and a correspondent of Descartes. On the basis of material uncovered by Dibon the exchange between Andreae and Clerselier can be reconstructed as follows.<sup>55</sup> In the first half of 1654 Andreae offered Clerselier manuscripts and letters of Descartes. The letter in which that offer was made is lost. But we do have the answer of Clerselier, or

---

51 Descartes offered a copy of that exchange to Huygens in January 1639 but, on the advice of Huygens gave up the idea of publishing it; Descartes to Huygens, 29 January 1639, AT II, 675–676; 6 May 1639, AT II, 677–678; Huygens to Descartes, 15 May 1639, AT II, 678–679.

52 Baillet, II, 241.

53 See the edition of Descartes’ *Recherche de la vérité* by E.-J. Bos (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2002), pp. xliii–xliv.

54 *Ibid.*, p. xlii.

55 Paul Dibon, ‘Clerselier, éditeur de la correspondance de Descartes’ (1984) in: *Regards sur la Hollande du Siècle d’Or* (Naples: Vivarium, 1990), pp. 495–522.

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

at least the minute (which unfortunately is undated but for reasons that will become clear must be well before 12 July 1654).<sup>56</sup> Clerselier sent Andreae a copy of what is now known as the ‘Stockholm Inventory’, on which he marked the items already in his possession—so by that time that document had finally come into existence. Andreae offered the *Traité de l’homme*, a letter on love (presumably the letter to Queen Christina) and letters to Chanut and to ‘several others’ (*alios aliquot*). Presumably Clerselier’s answer never reached its destination. In any case Andreae sent a copy of his first letter, which in turn prompted a reaction by Clerselier on 12 July 1654.<sup>57</sup> According to that letter Clerselier works ‘avec assiduité’ on the letters of Descartes and will publish them ‘dans peu de temps’. It costs him a lot of trouble ‘because [he] works only on the drafts [*brouillons*] which [Descartes] kept, and these are full of deletions and omissions and are not written with care’. As a result, he would be happy to receive any letters of Descartes, but he assures Andreae that he has good copies of the letters to princess Elizabeth and Chanut. Finally, he tells Andreae that he will also write to Johannes Clauberg (1622–1665), whose essays on the prejudices of childhood he has translated in order to include them in his edition.<sup>58</sup> Accordingly, even in July 1654 Clerselier’s documentation is not yet complete. He has a few items that are well written, in particular the letters to Elizabeth and Chanut—probably the same Chanut believed to be ready for publication. On the other hand there is no mention of the famous shipwreck, which according to Baillet has done so much damage, particularly to the correspondence—on the contrary Clerselier finds the difficulty of his task perfectly explicable.

In sum, the Stockholm inventory was made somewhere between the end of 1653 and the early spring of 1654, presumably in The Hague and with the assistance of Christiaan Huygens. Chanut forwarded a part of the letters to Clerselier, namely, those he believed Descartes himself had made ready for publication. He kept several other items because he was not sure that they should be published at all. The point to be underscored is that the nature of the editorial project as it was envisaged by Chanut profoundly changed under the hands of Clerselier—indeed, Clerselier wants to publish more than just the letters singled out for publication by Descartes himself. This explains, not only his interest in ‘brouillons’ but also the fact that he actively tries to interest correspondents of Descartes that are still living (like Andreae and Clauberg).

Clerselier’s *Lettres de Monsieur Descartes* are the first collective edition of the correspondence. It contains a total of 382 (119 + 128 + 125) letters. They are not always dated, the correspondent is not always identified (or is identified in the vaguest possible way, for example, as ‘a Jesuit’) and in the second volume Latin texts are translated into French. Although most of the time it is quite obvious what is the basis of Clerselier’s edition there are sometimes considerable problems. This becomes clear whenever the autograph of the same letter is also available—as, for example, in the case of the letters to Mersenne and to Huygens.

---

<sup>56</sup> Paris, BnF, n.a.f. 4730.

<sup>57</sup> The Hague, Royal Library, MS Dept. 73B34. It was first published by Dibon.

<sup>58</sup> That plan was never realized.

## Introduction

Sometimes it is also possible to use other historical evidence—as in the case of Regius—to prove that Clerselier misdated letters or pasted together drafts that do not belong to the same letter.<sup>59</sup>

Some of the philological and historical work already done in the 17th century (by Legrand, presumably, and in view of a new and more complete edition of Descartes' correspondence) was consigned to a copy of Clerselier's edition, which is now known as the 'Exemplaire de l'Institut'.<sup>60</sup> Although its importance is sometimes exaggerated, it is important enough to count as a separate source, because the notes are sometimes based on autographs that are lost now—sometimes, though, they amount to simple conjectures without any precise foundation in facts.

### *Renati Descartes Epistolae (1668)*

In 1668 the Amsterdam publisher Daniël Elzevier (a nephew of Louis) published the first two volumes of Descartes' correspondence in a Latin edition (the third volume was published by Blaeu in 1683), which is basically a translation of Clerselier's *Lettres*. So far it has not been possible to establish the identity of the editor.<sup>61</sup> The question is not unimportant for in a number of cases it is obvious that the anonymous editor had a different text at his disposal. This sometimes leads AT to prefer the version of the *Epistolae*, especially when Clerselier indicates that he gives a translation. Their choice is certainly too hasty, given the fact that in at least one case we managed to establish that the Latin text of the *Epistolae* was not the original text but simply a Latin translation of Clerselier's version (Letter 66). Inversely, it is also possible that the *Epistolae* provide a better text even if Clerselier does not indicate that he supplies a version (cf. Letter 67). It means that each case must be judged separately. General indications are, for example, the presence of a full signature: if a letter in Clerselier ends with a formula like 'je suis, etc.', whereas the same letter in the *Epistolae* ends with, for example, 'Tuus Renatus Des-Cartes' one may presume that the editors of the *Epistolae* had access to a different version of the text (cf. Letters 67 and 68). If that is the case one may also presume that Descartes' correspondent was Dutch—indeed, it is hard to see how a Dutch editor could have access to a text that was inaccessible to Clerselier unless the original letter circulated in the Netherlands. But, again, it has been our experience that each letter raises its own problems, which are not always easily disposed of.

---

<sup>59</sup> See E.-J. Bos, *The correspondence between Descartes and Regius* (Ph.D. diss. Utrecht University, 2002).

<sup>60</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France, MSS 4469, 4470, 4471. Background information on the *Exemplaire* is found in AT I, xlviiii–liiii, lxii–lxv, and Bos, xxxviii–xl.

<sup>61</sup> AT's claim that this edition was prepared by Johannes de Raey and Frans van Schooten is based on a confusion with the *praefatiuncula* to Elzevier's edition of the *Opera omnia* (1656). In any case, neither De Raey nor Van Schooten are mentioned in any of the editions of the *Epistolae* that we know of. Moreover, Van Schooten died in 1660.

## Correspondence of Descartes: 1643

### *La Vie de Mr Des-Cartes (1691)*

Adrien Baillet (1649–1706) was born 13 June in 1649 at Neuville (hence the pseudonym ‘M. de Neuville’), a small town between Beauvais and Clermont.<sup>62</sup> He was educated at the Beauvais Collège, where he also became a teacher of humanities. In 1676 he was ordained priest of the Diocese of Beauvais and in 1680 he moved to Paris to become librarian to the Président de Lamoignon. He was a prolific writer, who published not only erudite compilations and bibliographies like *Jugements des savants sur les principaux auteurs* (1685) and *Des auteurs déguisés* (1690) but also historical works like *Histoire de Hollande* (1690) and *Histoire des démêlés du Pape Boniface VIII avec Philippe le Bel* (published posthumously in 1718) as well as books on devotion and piety like *Dévotion à la Vierge et le culte qui lui est dû* (Paris 1694) and *Les vies des saints* (Paris 1701). These last works came under criticism from the Church because in her eyes Baillet was playing into the hands of anti-Catholics. His Jansenist sympathies were frequently blamed for this. He died in Paris 21 January 1706.

Although the *Vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes* is an important source for our knowledge of Descartes, its genesis has been little studied.<sup>63</sup> According to Baillet’s biographer it was the Abbé Legrand who, ‘avec quelques autres intéressés’, engaged Baillet ‘à ranger par ordre les mémoires qu’il [Legrand] avoit recueillis sur la Vie et la Philosophie du célèbre Philosophe de nos jours Mr. Descartes’.<sup>64</sup> Allegedly, that was in 1690—one year before the publication of Descartes’ Life. It means that Baillet has worked very hard for the work (two volumes of c.500 pages each) was, still according to Baillet’s biographer, ready to be printed on 19 February 1691. This is compatible with what we know on the basis of independent sources, more specifically a letter of Baillet to the abbé Nicaise of April–May 1689, in which Legrand is still presented as the one who prepares a history of Descartes’ life and of Cartesianism.<sup>65</sup> And even as late as April 1690 Legrand wrote about the biographical project without mentioning Baillet.<sup>66</sup> It is also compatible with what Baillet claims himself about the genesis of his work.

<sup>62</sup> For all details concerning Baillet’s life see ‘Abrégé de la vie de M. Baillet’, written by La Monnoye as an introduction to the new edition of Baillet’s *Jugements des Savants* (Paris, 1722. Amsterdam, 1725).

<sup>63</sup> Virtually the only article on this subject is that by Gregor Sebba, ‘Adrien Baillet and the Genesis of his *Vie de M. Des-Cartes*’, in: *Problems of Cartesianism*, eds. Th.M. Lennon, J.M. Nicholas, J.W. Davis (Kingston/Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1982), pp. 9–60.

<sup>64</sup> B. La Monnoye, ‘Abrégé de la vie de M. Baillet’, in Baillet, *Jugemens des ouvrages des savants* (new edn. Amsterdam, 1725), vol. 1.

<sup>65</sup> Baillet to Nicaise [April–May 1689], Paris, BnF, f.fr. 9361, fos. 172r–173r.

<sup>66</sup> Legrand to Jean-Robert Chouet (1642–1731) in Geneva, 10 April 1690. The letter is partly quoted in AT I, xlvi, without further references. We are much obliged to Mr N. Turrettini for providing us with a xerox of Legrand’s letter, which is in the private archives of the Turrettini family. In his letter Legrand thanks Chouet for his effort to contact the family of Alphonse Pollot. He regrets that Descartes’ letters to Pollot are not found, but he would be grateful for any information on Pollot’s life. Legrand furthermore announces that after Descartes’ *Life* has been written, he will work on a history of Cartesianism and its spread throughout Europe. He implores Chouet’s help for an account of the reception of Cartesianism in Switzerland. Although Chouet did not succeed in recovering the letters to Pollot, they were not irretrievably lost: In 1868 Eugène de Budé published them from a 17th century manuscript copy (see Letter 43, p. 126).

## Introduction

According to the preface he accepted his task reluctantly and after much pressure: ‘I had enough force to resist them but none to defend me against their authority’—which may be an allusion to the role of Chrétien-François de Lamoignon (1644–1709), his patron.<sup>67</sup> His own role on the other hand would only have been to present ‘the truth of the matter with some order or method’, that is, ‘to give the facts the order which they have held in the life of the philosopher, after verifying them’—in any case it is likely that Baillet worked on material provided by Legrand.

Who was Jean-Baptiste Legrand? Virtually all we know is that Clerselier designated him as his successor. More specifically Legrand would make available those works of Descartes which remained unpublished so far. Clerselier even left Legrand the sum of 500 pounds to finish his work.<sup>68</sup> According to a letter of Legrand to Chouet of 10 April 1690, he possessed ‘all manuscripts of Mr Descartes which were not yet printed, on top of 120 letters, which I have collected from various persons’.<sup>69</sup> According to Baillet Legrand retrieved not only the letters of Regius, but also those to Picot, to Clerselier, to Tobias Andreae ‘and others’, as well as testimonies on Descartes’ life from Chevalier Terlon, Princess Elizabeth, Chanut and ‘various private persons’.<sup>70</sup> But despite his many years of editorial labor, Legrand never managed to send anything to the printer. After his death in 1704 all manuscripts he had received from Clerselier and those which he had collected himself were lost.

Others who supplied material for Descartes’ *Life* were the still living members of the Descartes family: Joachim Descartes de Kerlau (1627–1700), the eldest son of Descartes’ brother Pierre, Joachim Descartes de Chavagnes (1635–1718), the eldest son of Descartes’ half-brother Joachim, and ‘Mademoiselle Descartes’, that is, Catherine Descartes (1637–1706), a daughter of Pierre, who became known as a poetess and *bel esprit*.<sup>71</sup> They provided Legrand with genealogical and other information on Descartes’ family as well as copies of the

---

<sup>67</sup> This is the opinion of Sebba. The fact that the work was eventually dedicated to Lamoignon gives some support to that hypothesis, but it must be pointed out that the evidence is very small.

<sup>68</sup> We did not find Clerselier’s testament but the conditions for research in the French National Archives are unfavourable (and will remain so until 2005). We did manage to see the inventory made after Clerselier’s death on 10 and 11 January 1685 (Paris, Archives Nationales, Minutier central des notaires de Paris, Étude 39 (Pasquier), liasse 159). It contains no trace of this settlement. So either it was arranged between Clerselier and Legrand before Clerselier died, or it was settled in Clerselier’s will—500 pounds is presumably too large a sum to be left out of the estate.

<sup>69</sup> ‘Je vous diray pour votre consolation, Monsieur, que tous les manuscrits de Mr Descartes qui n’ont point encore été imprimez sont en ma possession, outre 120 lettres que j’ay receuillies de diverses personnes, sans parler des memoires qui me sont venues de la part de la famille qui subsiste encore avec éclat dans le parlement de Bretagne’, Legrand to Chouet, 10 April 1690, see note 66 above.

<sup>70</sup> Baillet, I, xxii. Chevalier Hugues de Terlon (c.1620–1690) was French ambassador in Sweden. In 1666–1667 he organized the transport of Descartes’ body to France.

<sup>71</sup> Baillet, I, xxiii. On both Joachims see Frédéric Saulnier, *Le Parlement de Bretagne 1554–1790, Répertoire alphabétique et biographique de tous les membres de la Cour*, 2 vols. (Rennes: Plihon/Hommay, 1909. 2nd edn., Mayenne: Imprimerie de la manutention, 1991), vol. 1, pp. 297–298. In 1657 Joachim III married Prudence Sanguin, who died in 1675. After he had settled his daughters in marriage he took holy orders. He died in the chateau of Piré and was buried in the church of the village.

### Correspondence of Descartes: 1643

letters Descartes had written to his brother and father.<sup>72</sup> Presumably they are also the source of the various contracts which are cited by Baillet.

Baillet also cites ‘M. de la Barre, président au bureau des finances de Tours et ancien ami du philosophe’. Presumably this is Jean de La Barre, sieur de Fontenay, of noble family (their armscoat was ‘d’azur à la bande d’or accostée de deux croissants montants d’or’).<sup>73</sup> His main contribution may have been that he directed Baillet to a local historian Pierre Carreau (1631–1708), who ever since 1675 had been busy collecting material for a history of Tours.<sup>74</sup> Baillet also thanks, the ‘abbé Chanut’, that is, Martial Chanut, son of the Chanut who was French ambassador in Sweden<sup>75</sup>; ‘M. Clerselier Desnoyers’, that is, François, the eldest son of Claude Clerselier; and various other people who are hard to identify and whose contribution to Baillet’s *Life* cannot easily be retraced.

It should also be underlined that neither Baillet nor Legrand intervened directly—indeed, a pivotal role was played by Nicaise, who took the trouble of writing, not only to Rome and Geneva, but also to the Low Countries—to Graevius, Le Clerc, De Witt, Bayle and Basnage de Beauval. Graevius apparently sent a few books and pamphlets, but they had trouble reaching their destination.<sup>76</sup> De Witt—who is no other than the son of Jan de Witt, the pensionary of Holland—sent a few pamphlets as well, which were forwarded by Basnage de Beauval, but basically excused himself: ‘si mes livres estoient en ordre, je vous aurois pu envoyer tout ce que vous souhaitiez par vostre Memoire<sup>77</sup>; mais ma Bi-

<sup>72</sup> See n. 69.

<sup>73</sup> Baillet, I, xxiii. For genealogical information on the La Barre family see P. Robert, *Familles de Touraine et alliances XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles—Approches par tableaux généalogiques*, 1re série (2 fasc), (Centre généalogique de Touraine, 1989); 3e série, (Centre généalogique de Touraine, 1993). The dates of La Barre are unknown, except that he was still alive in 1691. On other members of this family, see J.-L. Chalmel, *Histoire de Touraine*, 4 vols. (Paris/Tours: Fournier, 1828), vol. 4, pp. 257–258.

<sup>74</sup> In 1690 he published a *Dessein et Histoire du Pays et du Duché de Touraine* (7 pages, no date, no publisher; BnF, Rés. LK2-1763), to ask the public, and especially the nobility, to provide further archeological or genealogical information if they had any. In 1697 the work was ready. After Carreau’s death his work was used, copied and augmented by the Benedictines for their *Histoire générale de la France* (especially vols. 23 and 24 by Dom Housseau), and finally plagiarized by Jean-Louis Chalmel; see Boulay de la Meurthe, *Pierre Carreau et les travaux sur l’histoire de Touraine jusqu’à Chalmel* (Tours: Mame, 1919).

<sup>75</sup> Baillet, I, xxiv. Martial Chanut (1631–1695) was chaplain of Anna of Austria (the mother of Louis XIV), and general visitor of the French Carmelite nuns. In 1666 he supported the initiative of reburial of Descartes’ remains in France and testified of his belief in the sincerity of Descartes’ Christian sentiments by depositing a sworn declaration; Paris, BnF, n.a.f. 23.114. He translated the Acts of the Council of Trent (1674) as well as St Theresa’s autobiography (1691).

<sup>76</sup> Johannes Graevius (1632–1703) in Utrecht wrote to Nicaise on 7 June 1689 (BnF, f.fr. 9359, fos. 291–292) and 26 February 1690 (ibid., fo. 241), basically to tell him that he could not be of much help, not only because most of the pamphlets he had asked were already lost, but also because none of Descartes’ contemporaries were still alive—except Johannes de Raey, who refuses all co-operation because ‘cum semper fuerit morosior, aetas grandis iam ipsum reddidit morosissimum’. Bayle to Nicaise [date unknown], ibid. fos. 358–359. The books were forwarded by a ‘Mr Vroesen’, that is, Jan Vroesen, son of an important Rotterdam family, who regularly traveled to France. He was the (anonymous) author of the clandestine manuscript *Traité des trois imposteurs*; cf. Silvia Berti, ‘Jan Vroesen, autore del *Traité des trois imposteurs*’, *Rivista storica italiana*, 53 (1991), 528–543. See also Berti’s edition of that work: *Trattato dei tre impostori. La vita e lo spirito del signor Benedetto de Spinoza* (Turin: Einaudi, 1994).

<sup>77</sup> Apparently Nicaise had sent a list of titles he wanted to have, as he had done to other Dutch

## Introduction

bibliothèque et tout ce qui [*sic*] i'ay ramassé pendant mes Voyages est dans un plus grand desordre que celle de Mr Maljabechi a Florence?<sup>78</sup> Apart from Le Clerc (see above) nobody mentions letters or manuscripts. Accordingly, it is likely that no new letters came in the possession of Baillet after 1690.

### THE PRESENT EDITION

#### *New sources and texts, new dates and rejected letters*

Not everything one would like to know is as yet known and in any case one should be wary of hasty conclusions. In the present edition, which covers no more than one year of the correspondence, we managed to arrive at a satisfactory solution in most cases, even if a few points remain unsettled. Still, we do hope that the advantages of this new edition are not limited to a clearer presentation of the text but will also show that to arrive at any conclusion at all it is necessary to go back to the sources, to reassess the material and to have a fresh look at the evidence.

Our study of the sources of Descartes' correspondence of 1643 has yielded several new texts. We have found the autograph of Descartes' letter to Mersenne of 2 February 1643 (Letter 9), for whose text AT and CM had recourse to a manuscript copy and to Clerselier's edition. We made a new transcription of the autograph letter to Huygens dated 10 July 1643 (Letter 37), which had already been published by Foucher de Careil, but who did not personally consult the autograph himself. The letter, which was assumed to be lost since the second half of the 19th century, is being kept in Uppsala. Unfortunately, we also have to report the definite loss of an autograph letter: Descartes' letter to Colvius dated 5 September 1643 (Letter 39) was destroyed during WW II. On the level of manuscript copies, we are happy to announce the rediscovery of the codex containing the 26 letters of Princess Elizabeth to Descartes and one letter by Queen Christina to Descartes. After the restoration of the castle Rosendael in the 1980s, the manuscript appeared to be missing, and many scholars have been searching for it in vain. Informed of our project Johan Carel Bierens de Haan was able to retrace the manuscript, and our study of it has certainly improved the earlier editions by Foucher de Careil and AT.<sup>79</sup> Unknown copies of letters to Elizabeth were found in the British Library, enabling us next to replacing the known texts (published by Clerselier) to append a precise date to one of the letters as well (Letters 58 and 61). An unknown copy of another letter to Elizabeth, 21 May 1643, turned up in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek in The Hague (Letter 19). Furthermore, on an indication of Aza Goudriaan we found the undoubtedly original text of Descartes' letter to Van Buitendijck (Letter 66), published by Tobias Andreae in a defence of Cartesianism in 1653.<sup>80</sup> Finally, the comparison between

---

correspondents.

<sup>78</sup> De Witt to Nicaise, 27 October 1689, Letters to Nicaise, vol. 5, Paris, BnF, f.fr. 9362, fo. 112v.

<sup>79</sup> A description of the manuscript is given below, p. xxxiiff.

<sup>80</sup> Jacobus Revius, *A theological examination of Cartesian philosophy*, ed. A. Goudriaan (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2002), pp. 48–49.

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

Clerselier's edition and the Latin *Epistolae* resulted on one occasion in a different source text (Letter 67).<sup>81</sup>

Our new collation of the sources means a genuine improvement of the existing editions. Although a significant number of mistakes in previous editions could be corrected, they are in general of minor importance. It is our observation that for the 1643 letters to Mersenne, the edition of AT is to be preferred above CM, except of course in case CM presents an autograph letter for the first time.

We have been able to give a more precise date to a fair number of letters. The most notable shift is probably Descartes' letter to an unknown inhabitant of Utrecht, which AT places in March 1642, but in fact must have been written in September 1643 (Letter 40). Three letters by Regius, which are dated 'Summer 1642' in AT, have been moved to 1643, following the edition of Bos (Letters 1–3). Further mention should be made of Letters 15, 43, 57, 58 and 61. Letters 66–68 are dated [1643?] in AT, which in our view is too narrow. The letters are nevertheless incorporated in the 1643 edition because '1643' is still a good possibility and there are no alternative dates. It is our policy not to remove a letter from its traditional place unless upon compelling evidence. Such evidence exists for two letters.

The first one is the letter usually assigned to 1643 in which Descartes writes about a 'perfect keyboard' the correspondent wishes to have built for his little daughter. The letter is published in Clerselier giving neither date nor addressee (AT IV, 678–680). AT conjectures that it is directed to Huygens and possibly written in 1646.<sup>82</sup> Cornelis de Waard proposes the hypothesis that the addressee is Colvius, and gives the precise date 6 July 1643.<sup>83</sup> De Waard makes a connection between the letter and a Cartesian text in a manuscript by Colvius now in Leiden University Library. The text from the manuscript entitled *Adversaria V.C. Andree Colvii* contains an outline of Descartes' division of the keyboard (AT IV, 722–725). According to De Waard the text is the 'systeme de musique' referred to in the letter. For Colvius did have a musically gifted daughter, who was ten years old in 1643, and as the letter refers to an earlier letter to the same addressee written 'on Sunday evening', De Waard conjectures that the preceding letter is the letter to Colvius of Sunday 5 July 1643 (Letter 34), the letter under discussion and the text on the harmonic system therefore being written on 6 July 1643.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> During our research we have uncovered much more manuscript material pertaining to Descartes' correspondence, including 19 autograph letters, most of which were never seen by the editors of AT and CM. We hope to make all this material available in the future. The crown of our efforts is the discovery of two completely unknown Descartes letters. The first, to Joachim de Wicquefort dd. 2 October 1640, is published in E.-J. Bos and C. Vermeulen, 'An unknown autograph letter of Descartes to Joachim de Wicquefort', *Studia Leibnitiana*, 34 (2002), 100–109. The second letter, in which Descartes gives his final judgment on Comenius' *Pansophia* (1639), will be published by J. van de Ven and E.-J. Bos in the *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*.

<sup>82</sup> In 1933 Charles Adam suggested that the letter may be written to De Wilhem, dating from 1640, cf. 'Correspondance de Descartes. Nouveau classement', *Revue Philosophique de la France et l'étranger*, 65 (1933), 373–401, esp. pp. 396–397.

<sup>83</sup> C. de Waard, 'Sur le destinaire et la date à attribuer à une lettre de Descartes sur une épinette parfaite', *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences*, 3 (1950), 251. Cf. AT IV, 803.

<sup>84</sup> 'Je ne receus vostre derniere que lundy matin, une heure apres avoir envoye celle que ie vous

## Introduction

Now, some things do not add up. First, Descartes' reference to 'Monday morning' renders it rather unlikely that the letter itself is written on Monday as well; presumably it is some day later in the week. Second, Descartes writes that he will not send his 'system', which rules out that both texts were dispatched together. There being no clear connection between the two texts, except for the fact that both deal with Descartes' division of the octave, the argument that the addressee is Colvius loses its force. The question of the letter's date and addressee still remain to be settled, and there is no reason to include it in the present edition. It should be noted, however, that Descartes' division of the octave as discussed in both texts is not found in the *Musicae compendium* (1618), but appears to be developed in 1638. In January 1638 Johannes Albertus Bannius (1598–1644) wrote that he discussed the building of a perfect keyboard with Descartes, who subsequently 'tradidit mihi systema Diapason ac divisionem octavae'.<sup>85</sup> This 'systema' appears to be the system referred to in the letter and may be the text uncovered by De Waard.

The second item that we do not incorporate in the 1643 edition is from the correspondence between Descartes and Regius. Baillet's inseparable references to Regius' letters 23 and 24 are dated 'Summer 1642' in AT but are redated 'late July or August 1643' in Bos.<sup>86</sup> Bos' argument rests primarily on the assumption that the anti-Cartesian pamphlet by a certain Theophilus Cosmopolita (1643) is actually mentioned in Regius' letters, but this is by no means certain. What seems to be the case is that it is Baillet who attributes the pamphlet to Voetius, not Regius. It is Baillet's own claim that the style of the pamphlet is Voetian, which is presumably the reason that he refers to Regius' letters. Regius in turn appears to have made an allusion to the *Admiranda methodus*, which was being written in the autumn of 1642, so the date of the letters 23 and 24 should be between July and December 1642.<sup>87</sup>

## Annotation

Earlier we observed that AT contains much information which is redundant or erratic or is printed in places where one would not expect it, whereas essential information, on Dutch personalities and events in particular, is often lacking. Our approach to the annotation of the correspondence is as follows. Short historical notes on persons and events whenever this is necessary for the understanding of the text are placed below the text. For these notes we could draw on research

---

écrivis dimanche au soir, ce qui est cause que ie n'y adioûtay point mon systeme pour faire un instrument de Musique qui soit parfait', AT IV, 678–679. For a recent discussion on the contents of both the letter and the text on the harmonic system, see R. Rasch, 'Why were enharmonic keyboards built?—From Nicola Vicentio (1655) to Michael Bulyowsky (1699)', *Schweizer Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft*, 22 (2002), 35–93.

<sup>85</sup> Bannius to William Boswell, 15 January 1638, CM VII, 2–3.

<sup>86</sup> Baillet, II, 177, 178–179, 204–205; AT III, 571–572, 572–573, and AT VIII B, 337, note c; Bos, 167–169.

<sup>87</sup> For the printing history of the *Admiranda methodus* (Utrecht 1643) and its authorship, see Appendix 1.

that has been done since the first publication of AT, as well as our own research related to Descartes' correspondence. As examples of both categories may serve the identification of a medical work read by Descartes and referred to in a letter to Vorstius (Letter 28), and the identification of the 'inventeur de la vis', who is mentioned in the correspondence between Descartes and Huygens, and who met with both to discuss his invention (see especially Letter 55). At times however a topic raised in a letter needs a more elaborate commentary than can be given in a footnote. Such commentaries are found behind each letter. This policy is already adopted in AT and was further developed in CM, but whereas such digressions in CM especially contain primary material without much elucidation or seem to be written for specialists in the history of mathematics and physics etc. alone, in-depth annotation ought to be accessible to the general reader of Descartes. The contributions by Carla Rita Palmerino and Henk Bos may serve as examples.

Recurring themes in the correspondence have been addressed with a separate essay on the topic in question, and these are found in the Appendices. The subject of the Utrecht Crisis—the history of Descartes' *Epistola ad Voetium*, its reception by the Utrecht *Vroedschap* and the consequences of their condemnation of the work—is touched upon in practically every letter written in 1643. To assist the reader in keeping track of the developments in the Utrecht Crisis and to avoid both the scattering of background information as well as being repetitive, the important aspects of the affair are assembled and commented upon in Appendix 1. The same holds true, although they do not dominate the correspondence to the same extent as the Utrecht Crisis, for the affair of the 'Illustrious Brotherhood of Our Blessed Lady' of 's-Hertogenbosch (Appendix 2) and the mathematical problem Descartes proposed to Elizabeth (Appendix 3).

As we remarked above (p. x) discussion is possible on what exactly can be considered to be a letter and should have a place in the correspondence; on the other hand, there is little disagreement that material like contracts or entries in *alba amicorum* do not pertain to a correspondence. We put the latter kind of material—and texts relative to Descartes in general—in a Calendar of Descartes' life. It contains, for example, the text of the condemnation by the Utrecht *Vroedschap* or the statement by someone that he met Descartes a week ago. To be sure, the Calendar serves more than one purpose, but the material it contains should, first, be precisely dated, and second, have any relevance to Descartes biographically. The Calendar is in fact meant as a *chronicle*: it supplies the factual knowledge we have of Descartes' life. The Hobbes chronicle published by Karl Schuhmann serves as our example.<sup>88</sup>

A biographical dictionary completes this edition. It supplies the bio-bibliographical data of Descartes' correspondents and the persons referred to in the letters. It relates not just their relation to the French philosopher, but also discloses their mutual family ties, friendships and correspondence networks. The research done in this part of the edition has revealed the identity of some persons who remained unknown till now, as for example the 'inventeur de la vis' men-

---

<sup>88</sup> K. Schuhmann, *Hobbes. Une chronique* (Paris: Vrin, 1998).

### *Introduction*

tioned above (Simeon Hulsebos), and has improved and extended our knowledge of many others.

#### *Manuscript sources*

Manuscript sources of the correspondence of 1643 are found in the institutions given below.

Arnhem  
Stichting Vrienden der Geldersche Kasteelen  
Letters 18, 27, 32, 59

Brussels  
Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique  
Letter 9

Florence  
Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale  
Letter 22

The Hague  
Koninklijke Bibliotheek  
Letters 19, 24

Leiden  
Universiteitsbibliotheek  
Letters 15, 19, 25, 28, 30, 33, 34, 36, 38, 53

Lille  
Bibliothèque municipale  
Letter 12

London  
British Library  
Letters 58, 61

Paris  
Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France  
Letter 4, 13

Paris  
Bibliothèque nationale de France  
Letters 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 29, 41, 42, 46, 49, 50, 54, 55, 60

Uppsala  
Universitetsbibliotek  
Letter 37

## *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

### *Description of the main collections*

The edition of Descartes' correspondence ideally contains a description of the main collections of letters in manuscript. Whereas the description of a single letter in a collection can sufficiently be dealt with in the introductory remarks preceding every letter in this edition, a collection of letters often shares common features and have a provenance of importance for the history of Descartes' correspondence in general. From the outset it was clear that it would be impossible to have the present edition of 1643 preceded by descriptions of this kind. This is the reason why for this edition we concentrate on the Van Pallandt collection, the letters of Queen Christina and Princess Elizabeth to Descartes. It is, however, inevitable that we start with some remarks on the La Hire collection—at present a more definitive description of the collection cannot be given.

### *The La Hire Collection*

After the death of Mersenne a collection of about 85 letters of Descartes to Mersenne came into the possession of Gilles Personne de Roberval (1602–1675). Roberval bequathed his mathematical papers among which the letters to the Académie des Sciences. The collection remained in the Académie des Sciences (after the Revolution in the Institut de France) until the first half of the 19th century, when they were stolen and sold by the genius in forgery and theft of valuable manuscripts, Guglielmo Libri. The letters were dispersed but large portions have found their way back to the Institut de France and the BnF. The remaining letters either still remain hidden in private collections or are in various libraries and musea all over the world.

Whereas Clerselier was not able to use them for his edition of the correspondence—he complained about Roberval's refusal and implied that he had more or less stolen them (AT V, 777).<sup>89</sup> By contrast, Baillet had access to the collection and used them for his biography, and, perhaps more importantly, so did the annotators of the *Exemplaire de l'Institut*. They collated the existing edition of the letters in the Clerselier edition with the autographs, carefully noting the differences, they completed letters, supplied dates and indicated Clerselier's errors in the division or patching together of parts of letters. For several letters the notes in the *Exemplaire de l'Institut* are the only source. It is generally assumed, although it should be underscored that this still needs to be proven, that this editorial labor is primarily the work of Clerselier's successor Legrand. In his preface Baillet thanks Philippe de La Hire (1640–1718), a member of the Académie des Sciences, for allowing Legrand and him to use the collection.

All letters formerly in the La Hire collection have the same kind of notes and marks on the first folio recto, and in this edition they are described in the introduction to each letter. The letters were numbered several times. The most

---

<sup>89</sup> The truth is presumably that Mersenne confided them to Roberval shortly before his death. See A. Gabbey, 'Mersenne et Roberval', *Actes du colloque "1588–1988. Quatrième centenaire de la naissance de Marin Mersenne"*, J.-M. Constant and A. Fillon (eds.) (Maine 1994), pp. 93–111.

## Introduction

ancient numbering is found in the left bottom of each letter, which numbering is labelled the 'original' La Hire numbering by AT. The number is often followed by the letter 'C', as for example in Letter 9, which has the number 35 C. The meaning of the letter 'C' is unknown. Remarkably, the 'original' numbering has a reversed chronological order. A second numbering, called the 'definitive' La Hire list by AT, is found in the notes of the *Exemplaire de l'Institut*. They often supply both the 'original' (which number is usually crossed out) and the 'definitive' number. The letters were numbered a third time by Germain Poirier (1724–1803) towards the end of the 18th century. His numbering is usually found in the right upper corner and is put between brackets. Poirier also appears to be the author of a note in the left margin giving the date of the letter, again between brackets, followed by the abbreviation 'v.d.' (vraie date). It is supplied only if the letter is dated by Descartes. Finally, in the left upper corner one usually finds an ink note in an unidentified 17th century hand that gives the place of the letter in the edition of Clerselier.<sup>90</sup>

### *The Van Pallandt Collection (Arnhem)*

Manuscript copy. iii+81+iv fos. (210x160 mm). c.1700–1730.

Title: *Recueil de quelques Lettres écrites à Monsieur Descartes* (p. 1).

Paper. c.17 [15–18] lines. Late 19th-century or early 20th-century pagination with pencil, one hand (1–158). Signature formula: 1–2<sup>2</sup>, 22<sup>4</sup>, 23<sup>2</sup>. Watermarks: a) coat of arms of the city of Amsterdam, monogrammed AJ (=Abraham Janssen (1656–1710, Dutch factor at Angoulême, Puymoyen mill), 1700–1710; b) like a), monogrammed DA; c) Pro patria; d) flower, below letter R. Contemporary endpapers.

Early 18th-century italic. Written by one hand. Contemporary marginal notes in ink (pp. 9, 40, 66, 71, 95, 99, 112, 125, 132, 139, 144), French (references to Descartes' letters to Elizabeth in vols. I and III of Clerselier). 19th-century marginal notes (pp. 3 and 34, references to Clerselier) and numbering of Elizabeth's letters (erratic) in pencil. Contemporary pasteboard binding, damaged (210x160x15 mm). Gatherings sewn on three parchment bands.

Contents (pagenumber, description, number of the letter in the manuscript (missing numbers given between square brackets), AT number, number in the 1643 edition if available):

1	<i>Title: Recueil de quelques Lettres écrites à Monsieur Descartes</i>		
3–5	<i>Christina to Descartes</i>		AT 532
5	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [1]	AT 499
9	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [2]	AT 461
18–22	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [3]	AT 519

<sup>90</sup> For further details on the La Hire collection, see AT I, li–lxi, and AT II, v–xix.

*Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

22	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [4]	AT 526	
28	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [5]	AT 402	
34–40	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [6]	AT 406	
40–47	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [7]	AT 473	
47	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [8]	AT 522	
53	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 9	AT 414	
57	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [10]	AT 578	
61	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 11	AT 469	
66	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 12	AT 389	
71–80	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [13]	AT 409	
80	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 14	AT 400	
85	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 15	AT 384	
89–92	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 16	AT 311	
92	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [17]	AT 327	Letter 59
95	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 18	AT 301	Letter 18
99–104	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [19]	AT 308	Letter 27
104	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [20]	AT 377	
112	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 21	AT 450	
125–132	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [22]	AT 487	
132	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 23	AT 431	
139	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 24	AT 353	
144–149	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. 25	AT 412	
149	<i>Elizabeth to Descartes</i>	no. [26]	AT 441	
152–158	<i>Christina to [Chanut]. Header: Lettre de la Reine de Suede à Mr Descartes écrite à Upsal le 27me fev. 1654 Incipit: Je vous ay rendu conte</i>			

*Provenance*

The manuscript was discovered (around 1875) by the antiquarian bookseller Frederik Muller (1817–1881) in the library of the castle of Rosendael (near Arnhem), then the property of Baron Reinhardt J.C. van Pallandt (1826–1899).<sup>91</sup> Muller notified Foucher de Careil, whom had asked him ‘about 20 years ago’ to keep him informed on any new finds relative to Descartes.<sup>92</sup> In 1879 Foucher de Careil published the 26 letters of Princess Elizabeth to Descartes and the two letters by Queen Christina of Sweden, one to Descartes, the second, as Foucher de Careil conjectured, to Chanut. The manuscript has subsequently been consulted by Adam and Tannery, and, according to his own saying, also by Jacques Chevalier.<sup>93</sup> None of the editors has addressed the question of the provenance,

<sup>91</sup> Muller announced his discovery in a short article, ‘27 onuitgegeven brieven aan Descartes’, *De Nederlandsche Spectator*, 1876, pp. 336–339.

<sup>92</sup> A. Foucher de Careil, *Descartes, la Princesse Élisabeth, et la Reine Christine d’après des lettres inédites* (Paris/Amsterdam: Germer-Baillière/Muller, 1879), p. iii.

<sup>93</sup> R. Descartes, *Lettres sur la morale*, ed. J. Chevalier (Paris: Boivin, [1935]).

## Introduction

and there is admittedly little to go on. More or less certain is, however, the period during which the copy was made. The watermarks date the manuscript in the early 18th century, which renders Foucher de Careil's remark that the hand of the scribe is 17th century obsolete. Apparently, the manuscript was not acquired by R. van Pallandt himself, neither Muller nor Foucher de Careil indicate this. A remarkable fact in the history of the castle is that it changed hands by sale only once; since 1579 it remained in the hands of the allied families Van Dorth/Van Arnhem (1579–1721), Torck (1721–1902), and finally Van Pallandt (1902–1977).<sup>94</sup> This happy circumstance ensured the persistence of the library, which was dispersed only in 1949–1950, when the valuable items were auctioned (the letters of Elizabeth not being one of them).<sup>96</sup> The auction catalogues show that the residents of Rosendael took a genuine interest in science and philosophy. Descartes' works are very well presented: 9 works of Descartes, all printed before 1700, among which the first edition of the *Passions de l'ame* (1649) and the complete Clerselier edition of the correspondence. Other *cartesiana* are works by De la Forge, Wittich and De Raey. An inventory of the library made around 1930 mentions moreover the abridged version of Baillet's *Vie* (1693).<sup>97</sup> We may conclude that the manuscript with the letters to Descartes was not an isolated item in the library. Clearly someone (if we are talking of just one person) in the second half of the 17th century was much interested in the philosophy of Descartes, and this person would have considered the manuscript a welcome addition on his *cartesiana* sometime between c.1700 and 1730. He or she took the trouble to refer, in the margin of Elizabeth's letters, to Descartes' answers in the Clerselier edition. Could it be the 'J.P. Torck' whose *ex libris*, according to the 1930 inventory, is found in the copy of Descartes *Passions*? So far we have not been able to identify this person.

According to a note on the wrapper that protects the manuscript the letters were copied 'sur les originales'.<sup>98</sup> This appears to be impossible, given the fact that the copy was made in the early 18th century and the fact that the original letters of Elizabeth were returned to her. The final letter in the manuscript

---

<sup>94</sup> Information on the history of the castle and its inhabitants is based on J.C. Bierens de Haan, *Rosendael, Groen Hemeltjen op Aerd. Kasteel, tuinen en bewoners sedert 1579* (Zutphen: Walburg pers, 1994).

<sup>95</sup> *Bibliotheek kasteel Rosendael bij Arnhem*, 1<sup>96</sup> deel, Verkoopung Juni 1949, door A.J. Huffel's Antiquariaat, F.W.G. Théonville, Utrecht; *Catalogus van de bibliotheek van het kasteel Rosendael* (tweede gedeelte), Verkoopung: 25–28 april 1950, door A.J. Huffel's Antiquariaat, F.W.G. Théonville, Utrecht. A copy of these catalogues with notes by the former owner of the library, W.F.T. baron van Pallandt, confirm the provenance of the works mentioned above (Collection Stichting Vrienden der Geldersche Kasteelen, Arnhem).

<sup>97</sup> 'Bibliotheek Kasteel Rosendael', 2 vols., c.1930 (Collection Stichting Vrienden der Geldersche Kasteelen, Arnhem), vol. 1, fos. 8v–9.

<sup>98</sup> The ink note is written in a late 19th century hand and reads: 'Receuil de quelques lettres écrites à Monsieur Descartes par la Reine de Suède et la Princesse de Bohême. Copiées sur les originales. 2 lettres de Christine et 26 d'Elizabeth, 1640–60, du temps de Gérard van Arnhem. On est prié de conserver les lettres intactes, de n'y jamais faire faire des changements. Elles ont une grande valeur. En 1879 Monsieur le Comte A. Foucher de Careil les a fait imprimer et communiquer au public avec l'agrément de Br van Pallandt, Seigneur de Rozendael, propriétaire de ce recueil [sic]'. Gerard van Arnhem (1598–1648) never lived at Rosendael but his library (without any works by Descartes) went to the castle after his death.

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

gives an indication of the real background of the material in the manuscript. It is written by Christina (27 February 1654) and erroneously addressed to Descartes. Foucher de Careil conjectures that it was actually addressed to Chanut, and this can now be confirmed; other copies of the same letter in which Christina amplifies her reasons for abdication exist and all identify Chanut as the addressee.<sup>99</sup> Now, after Descartes' death Chanut came into the possession of both the letter by Christina to Descartes (the first letter in the collection) and the letters by Elizabeth. He returned the letters to Elizabeth, but apparently only after he had them copied—despite his insistence that he had not touched them (see above, p. xviii). As Elizabeth stayed with her refusal to have her letters made public, Chanut lost his interest in publishing Descartes' correspondence with Christina, Elizabeth and himself, and left the project to Clerselier. He did however not send his copy of Elizabeth's letters to his son-in-law—indeed, no one was to know he had them copied. That Chanut had Elizabeth's letters copied cannot be proven, but it is difficult to explain the existence of a copy of her letters otherwise. In any case, the Rosendael manuscript is not Chanut's copy (to which the copies of Christina's letters were added later) but it is at its very best a copy from Chanut's copy.

Our knowledge of the provenance of the Rosendael manuscript has many gaps and is shrouded in mist. We do not know who acquired the manuscript nor when it became part of the library of Rosendael. And more intriguing perhaps, why is it the only known copy of Elizabeth's letters, and if Chanut is its original source, what is the fate of his personal copy? However, one problem has been solved: that of the apparent loss of the manuscript. Over the last decades scholars have in vainly attempted to locate the manuscript at the Gelders Archief in Arnhem where the private archives of the castle are being kept. In fact, it was never part of the private archives but of the library. The remnants of the library were temporarily relocated during the castle's renovation between 1985 and 1990; the books returned to their original place, but not the few manuscripts, among which the letters to Elizabeth. These were safely stored in the offices of the present custodian of the castle, the Stichting Vrienden der Geldersche Kasteelen in Arnhem.<sup>100</sup>

#### EDITORIAL METHODS

##### *Choice of copy text*

The autograph letter signed (abbreviated ALS) is the primary source for the text of a letter, and for the year 1643 we have the happy circumstance that no less

---

<sup>99</sup> BnF, n.a.f. 5371, fos. 40–41; BnF, MS Collection Rothschild; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Per Q 5, fos. 140–143. See also J.-F. de Raymond, *Descartes et Christine de Suède* (Paris: Lettres Modernes: 1993), pp. 123–125.

<sup>100</sup> After the death of W.F.T. Baron van Pallandt (†1977) the castle was bequeathed to the Stichting Het Geldersch Landschap. Since 1982 the Stichting Vrienden der Geldersche Kasteelen holds the castle in long lease.

## *Introduction*

than 27 autograph letters have survived and are in the public domain. When the ALS is lost or otherwise inaccessible, one needs to take secondary sources into consideration. The best alternative after the ALS itself is a manuscript copy or a printed version of the text directly from the ALS. Examples of the latter kind are the letter to Van Beverwijck published by Van Beverwijck himself (Letter 33), and the published photograph of the ALS of Letter 47—the ALS is probably still extant but its present location is unknown. The ALS of Letter 39 perished during WO II, and its transcription in AT is now the only source. The ‘minute’ of a letter, that is a draft version or a copy kept by the author, forms another source for the text of the letter. Manuscript material of this kind is rare in Descartes’ correspondence, the only example in 1643 being Colvius’ draft for a letter to Descartes (Letter 25). By contrast, printed versions of drafts and of copies are abundant. The Budé collection consisting of copies of Descartes’ letters to Pollot was not available to us, so the AT edition of these copies must be our principal source (see Letter 43). However, the most important source with printed drafts and copies is the three volume edition of Descartes’ correspondence by Clerselier. Finally, there may be references to, abstracts of or quotations from a letter. The best known source for this kind of material is the biography by Baillet, but another publication containing relevant material for the correspondence of 1643 is a work by Samuel Maresius (Letters 23, 31, 52, 63 and 65).

Clerselier’s edition presents the problem that the first volume was reprinted two times (in 1663 and 1667) and the second volume once (1666). There are differences between the various editions, not only qua spelling but there are also textual changes. Adam and Tannery prefer, without much of an argument, the latest edition of every volume (cf. AT I, civ–cv). We use the first edition for two reasons. First, in most cases the textual changes appear to be stylistic improvements by Clerselier himself, which do not originate from a new study of the source material.<sup>101</sup> Second, during every reprint the printer made mistakes in copying the earlier edition. If there are significant differences between the various editions they are indicated in the critical apparatus. Irrelevant variants between Clerselier and other sources are not mentioned in the critical apparatus. Compared to Descartes’ own usage, Clerselier usually writes numerals and abbreviations in full (‘trois’ instead of ‘3’, ‘Monsieur’ instead of ‘M<sup>r</sup>’, and so on). These expansions are not mentioned in the apparatus.

### *Presentation of the letters*

The header to each letter gives the number in the edition, the author of the letter, the addressee, the place of writing and the place the letter was sent to, and finally the date of the letter. Conjectures are placed between square brackets. We then give information on the source(s), edition(s), and at the end of the introduction a summary of the contents of the letter.

---

<sup>101</sup> Exception to this are Descartes’ letters to Regius, which Clerselier revised in the second edition of the first volume, and the correspondence with More (see the note by A. Gabbey in AT V, 668–677).

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

*Source(s)*. Manuscript material is dealt with differently from printed material. The kind of manuscript is indicated: ALS, draft, or copy. By copy we understand a copy of the ALS. Drafts and copies can be autograph documents as well, and if that is the case, it is indicated. Subsequently follow the location of the manuscript and shelfmark. If a manuscript constitutes the principal source for the text of the letter, a concise description is given, i.e. the number of (folded) sheets, the size of the first page, the number of written pages with their foliation, and the presence or absence of an address and/or seal. In case there is more than one source, the sources are listed in order of importance; the principal source, whose text is followed, being the first.

*Edition(s)*. In case of a manuscript source, its first publication is mentioned. If there is more than one manuscript source, the first publication of the most important source is mentioned (which is usually the ALS). Then follow the places in the standard editions of Descartes' correspondence (AT, AM, CM) and other relevant editions (for example, the Roth edition of the Descartes–Huygens correspondence, the edition of Huygens' correspondence by J. Worp). If there is more than one source, it is indicated which source is used in which edition. For example, prior to the publication of the ALS by Roth Letter 11 (to Huygens, 18 February 1643) was known via the draft published in Clerselier (Cle). This is indicated as follows: 'AT III, 617–630 (Cle); AT III, 805–814 (Roth); AM V, 257–264; CM XII, 57–67 (ALS)'. Because AM is not a critical edition, its source will not be indicated (AM generally adopts the AT text or Roth).

After the section dealing with sources and editions, space is reserved for a short discussion of problems relating to the author of the letter, the addressee, date, the history of the text and the choice of the copy text.

In the right margin we indicate the folio or page numbers of the source, or, in case there is more than one source, of the source mentioned first in the header (the folio or page breaks are indicated in the text by a vertical line), and the volume and page numbers of AT, and, if applicable, of CM as well (page breaks are not indicated).

In case a letter is known only in fragments or references, the various fragments and/or references are indicated by a letter of the alphabet (ABC, etc.). To contrast testimonies with actual letters, the former are printed in a smaller font. When it is unambiguously clear that a direct quotation from the letter is given, this is printed in the normal font size. Baillet's notes in the margin of his *Vie* are inserted in the main text between square brackets, preceded by the abbreviation *i.m.* (*in margine*).

There are three sequences of notes. Below the text are found textual notes, listed by line number, and short explanatory notes, keyed to superscript numbers. More elaborated annotation, also keyed to superscript letters, is found after the letter. See also above, pp. xxix–xxx.

#### *Principles of transcription*

Most manuscript sources have been collated anew, but there are some notable

## Introduction

exceptions. Letters 12 (Lille), 22 (Florence), and 37 (Uppsala) were transcribed from high quality xeroxes only, or, as in the last case, from a photograph as well as a high resolution color scan. The 15 letters from the Buxton collection (the Descartes–Huygens correspondence published by Roth) have not been studied from the source itself in the BnF. We limited ourselves to transcribing the microfilm. For some letters the film was of too inferior quality to make a reliable transcription, in which case we checked our collation to Roth's edition (which we have found to be very dependable). Permission to study the original letters is, understandably, not easily given, and we prefer to study the complete collection at one single occasion.

In the transcription of manuscripts and printed sources alike the following principles have been observed. The original lineation has not been adhered to, except for the signature and the address. If a paragraph was inserted by the editor this is indicated. The spelling of the long *s*, and of *u/v* has been made conform to modern usage. The distribution of *i/j* follows the sources, with two exceptions. First, when *j* is used before a consonant, for example, *jmpossible* has been changed into *impossible*. Second, if there is no system at all in the distribution of *i/j* we prefer the spelling most frequently used in the letter (so if *Ie* and *Je* are used interchangeably, we have changed *Je* into *Ie* if *Ie* is used more frequently, and viceversa). The ampersand (&) is always replaced by *et*.<sup>102</sup> In Latin texts the ligatures *æ/œ* are resolved into *ae/oe*. Insignificant contractions and abbreviations have been silently expanded. Not expanded are abbreviations that are still in use (for example, *etc.*), abbreviated titles (Mr, Rev.) and names of months (Ian.). Unusual abbreviations are expanded (e.g. Amb<assadeur>). When only an initial is given, the full name is added between angle brackets if there is no doubt about the identity of the person meant (e.g. St<ampioen>). Accents are reproduced as they appear in the original, except for the accents on *là*, *à* and *où*, which are supplied if absent. A cedilla is added before *a*, *o* and *u*. Huygens' dotting of the letter *y* is not reproduced. Emphasis in the original (underlining or written/printed in a different style) is rendered by italics. Words and passages in a different language are silently italicized even if they are not emphasized in the original. In general, original punctuation is respected, except when this causes confusion (for example in detailed discussions of experiments in letters to Mersenne). After each full stop the first letter of the new sentence is set in capitals. The first letter after the salutation has also been set in capital. Apart from that, the original capitalisation is respected, except when it is erratic.

For manuscripts the following additional rules apply. Apostrophes are silently added; if an apostrophe is deleted this is noted in the critical apparatus (see for example, Letter 13, p. 47, l. 52). Words written as one in the original are been separated if modern usage demands it (*ilya*). Similarly words separated in the original are writtten as one following modern usage. Exception to these rules are combinations of words which are nowadays written as one, but for which there was no general rule in the 17th century (*par ce que*, etc.); in those cases the

---

<sup>102</sup> It should be noted that AT in their transcription of Descartes' autographs adopts the contrary approach: in most cases they change *et* into an ampersand.

### *Correspondence of Descartes: 1643*

original text is respected. The use of hyphens between words is not normalised according to modern usage (*cy devant*, etc.).

In printed sources, evident printing errors are silently corrected. In the French texts of Clerselier and Baillet the use of the acute accent has been normalised according to modern French usage. The acute has thus been suppressed or changed into an accent grave (*cét* into *cet*, *pièce* into *pièce*).

#### *Critical apparatus*

In the critical apparatus variant readings are indicated, corrections and conjectures justified, and, if the primary source is a manuscript, details concerning the constitution of the text mentioned. The source of a variant reading is indicated by a siglum, unless the variant reading is from the primary source. Indeed, any text in the critical apparatus without siglum is from the primary source. If more than a single manuscript source is available, the different sources are represented by the sigla defined in the introduction to every letter (usually the first letter of the name of the collection). If necessary, a numeral is added (e.g. *B1*, *B2*).

If the main text is based on a manuscript, deletions and additions in the source are indicated as follows:

<– a>	<i>a</i> was deleted
<a>>b>	<i>a</i> was changed into <i>b</i> (via deletion and addition or conversion)
<+ a>	<i>a</i> was added (the exact place of the addition—above, in the margin, etc.—is not indicated for small additions)
<a ≠ b>	<i>a</i> was corrected into <i>b</i> during writing

A combination of different textual notes is possible. For example, ‘<(dont)>>ou] dont *Cle*’ explains that in the manuscript ‘dont’ was changed into ‘ou’, while Clerselier gives ‘dont’.

#### *Sigla*

Next to the abbreviations *AT*, *CM* and *Cle* (see p. viii) the following sigla are used:

<i>Bev</i>	Van Beverwijck
<i>Bor</i>	Borel
<i>E</i>	editor
<i>Epp</i>	<i>Epistolae</i>
<i>FdC</i>	Foucher de Careil
<i>add.</i>	added
<i>conj.</i>	conjecture
<i>corr.</i>	corrected
<i>om.</i>	omitted
<i>par. E</i>	new paragraph inserted by the editor