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The extant manuscript is described in relation to Russell’s Trinity College lecture course in 1899 and its subsequent preparation for the book of 1900. Alterations within the ms are reported. So are revisions that must have followed on a missing typescript, as derived from comparing G. E. Moore’s copy of the page proofs with the ms. His suggested changes are compared with the text of the first edition along with emendations Russell must have made on his own copy of the proofs.

The Bertrand Russell Archives contain the following prepublication documents for A Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibniz, as well as Russell’s corrected copy of the first edition:

1. A 511-leaf manuscript (the “extant MS”) of the front matter and chapters (RA 210.006549–FI-17). The leaves have been archivally number-stamped 1–514 (allowing for three missing leaves) in the top right corner. The paper is of the same laid quality and size (221 × 288 mm.) as Russell habitually used at this time, although insertions tended to be on lighter-coloured, wove paper. The ms, with three leaves in Alys Russell’s hand, is written only on the rectos; only four versos are not blank.1

1 Folios 172 and 175 (see below, section 1, notes 108: 24 and 110n.), and folios 344 (some mathematics) and 504 (an unrevised draft of the passage from G. II. 265 quoted in PL, p. 281). Folder 17 ends with a card depicting Leibniz’s house at Hanover. This must be the souvenir acknowledged in Russell’s letter of 18 September 1900 (A.-F. Schmid, ed., B. Russell, Correspondance sur la philosophie, la logique et la politique avec Louis Couturat [Paris: Kimé, 2001], 1: 195).
A photocopy of a set of serially date-stamped page proofs, corrected by G. E. Moore (RA REG. ACQ. 276). The original set is in the library of the State University of New York, Purchase. We do not have the proofs corrected by Russell, nor his correspondence with the publisher, Cambridge University Press, or his publishing contract.

The extant MS has the following components:

(1a) A 298-leaf MS (the “main MS”) of the front matter and chapters.

(1b) A 184-leaf MS of the appendix and index of leading passages, archivally number-stamped 299–482, except for folios 386–8 (missing, as noted at the time of filming, on the RA backup microfilm, reel 18).

(1c) Russell’s 32-leaf general index, number-stamped 483–514 and date-stamped 20 August 1900 by the printer.

(1d) A three-leaf MS of a discarded preface, included in (1a) as folios 18–20.

This paper is concerned chiefly with (1), the main MS, and (2), the page proofs. The discarded preface, (1d), is published for the first time to scholarly standards in this issue. There is little to report on (1b), the MS of the appendix: for the most part, it is neatly written out, with occasional corrections, insertions and deletions. We know from Russell’s correspondence with Moore and from the acknowledgements in the published book that the two took considerable pains over the translation of these passages (and other translated passages in the book).

The MS of the appendix was evidently selected and written out as a clean copy from what were probably heavily revised originals, perhaps on separate sheets or cards. On it Russell put a small pencil tick against each passage, presumably indicating that he had verified it with the original. He asked the printers to “be careful to put square and round brackets respectively as they occur in the MS” (fol. 304).


3 Also “discarded” was an Aristotelian paper derived from the unpublished book in February 1900. The paper survives in galley proof. Titled “Leibniz’s Doctrine of Substance as Deduced from His Logic”, it is comprised of new opening and closing paragraphs and substantial parts of PL, Chapters ii–v. See Papers 3: 20 for the text.

4 “I have made, however, as many corrections in consequence of your remarks as were possible without radical alteration …” (to Moore, 9 May 1900; O’BRIANT, p. 182).

5 This might explain otherwise mysterious references in the extant MS. “(11e)” may be a passage compilation number at 43: 6 and at 45n.; see similar references, “(8a)” at 65n.2 and “(33b)” at 114: 8, all in sec. 1 below.
In analyzing the extant MS, some distinctions among the texts, or states of the text, are in order. We are confident that Russell wrote the original MS as a series of lectures. This state is designated, in what follows, “MS1”. MS1 was very heavily revised, with some leaves omitted and many new ones added, to form the final version of the MS, which we designate “MS2”. In serving as his lectures script, MS1, for the most part, can be matched with the progress of Moore’s notes on the lectures actually given. MS1 contains many instances of second-person locutions, in which Russell seems to speak directly to his class. For example, at 113:12–13 in section I of the textual notes below, he wrote, “If any of you can suggest theory free from both these defects, I shall be glad to consider it”. Two lines below in MS1 he altered “lecture” to “chapter”. (The many instances of “lecture” were altered to “chapter” throughout MS2.) Several other contexts combined a second-person locution with use of the word “lecture”, and both were revised in the process of turning MS1 into MS2. Finally, MS1 contains three notes to himself written at the head or foot of the leaf. They were usually reminders to himself of something to discuss, and he did so in the next few leaves.

The extant MS, as a physical unit, is not what served as printer’s copy. This was a combination of the MS of the front matter and first chapter with a now lost typescript of the remaining chapters. Chapter II is mostly new writing since the delivery of the lectures, and Chapters I and III are wholly new; but both II and III, unlike Chapter I, must have been part of the ensuing typescript. At some point MS2 may have included revised MS1 leaves of the first three chapters; now only four such leaves remain, all in Chapter II. Since Chapter I, in the only form we have it, was not part of the typescript, it is designated “MS3”. MS2 was the manuscript as it was sent to the typist and, with the exception of Chapter I, is wholly extant. Most of MS1 is extant, being recoverable through the alterations recorded in section I.

---

6 This was his third course of lectures. He gave German Social Democracy as lectures to the London School of Economics in early 1896, and he lectured on the Foundations of Geometry at Bryn Mawr and Johns Hopkins later that year (Papers 1: 335).
7 Cf. Arthur and Griffin, “Moore’s Notes on Russell’s Leibniz Lectures”, above.
8 The many instances appear in section I (e.g. at 54:1 and 70:1; cf. also 191:14–15).
9 Other such passages will be found at 48:28–9, 75:18 and 25, 101:1, 113:15, 149:36 and 180:12 and 21.
10 The notes are recorded in section I at 13:26, 108:3–5 and 112:13.
It was Russell’s habit as a writer to number his leaves in the top right corner (usually omitting the folio number on the first leaf of a chapter or other grouping) and to indicate to which chapter each leaf belonged by writing a chapter label (usually the chapter number but sometimes a brief acronym of the chapter title) in the top left corner. In revising a document, he would rarely heavily correct it, preferring to write out the whole leaf afresh, though he would incorporate whole leaves which required little correction from an earlier draft into a new one, renumbering and relabelling them to fit their new location. He followed both practices in the Leibniz MS. He created MS2 from MS1 by revising original leaves, adding new leaves, and deleting old ones, with the exceptions of Chapters I–III. A record of both the foliation and the chapter labels in the main MS will be found in the appendix to this paper. The foliation is recorded, in reverse order, in the first column: the first number is the archival folio number, the second the final number Russell gave the leaf, followed (in parentheses) by any previous numberings. Typically, these last reflect his shifting around of content, not only within but also between chapters. The second column gives the chapter label on the leaf in MS2, while the third gives the cancelled label (if any) from MS1.

Russell’s reworking of MS1 is evident from the leaves which bear two different chapter labels, but the practice extends beyond those cases. In MS2 Russell used arabic numerals as chapter labels, whereas in MS1 he used roman numerals. In Chapter II, for example, Russell took folio 37 from MS1, changed the chapter label from “II” to “2”, and renumbered the leaf from “3” to “3a” so that it would fit in the new sequence. Similar changes occurred in Chapter 4 with folios 91–3. But earlier in Chapter 4, folios 75, 77–81 and 83–7 have only the chapter label “IV”, which suggests that they came from Lecture IV in MS1 and that Russell didn’t bother to change the number to arabic. That their source was indeed MS1 is confirmed by folio 82, a leaf which Russell added to MS2 and numbered “6a” and to which he gave the arabic chapter label “4”. Similarly marked insertions occur at folios 104 and 107 and several others. If the use of roman numerals as chapter labels indicates that a leaf originated in MS1, as it seems to, it is clear that most of the book originated there.

We learn from the chapter labels that there were originally seventeen lectures in MS1. Subsequently the sixteenth lecture (“The Place of God in Leibniz’s Philosophy”) was attached to the end of Chapter/
Lecture xv, and Lecture xvii’s roman numeral became a blotted “xvi”. There are other examples of material being moved from one heading to another without changing its place in the order of presentation. For example, the first three leaves of Lecture xi (“The Nature of Monads in General”) become the last three leaves of Chapter x (“The Theory of Space and Time and Its Relation to Monadism”), and the first seven leaves of Lecture xiii (“Details of the Doctrine of Monads”) become the last seven of Chapter xii (“Soul and Body”). The original presentation of the material as actual lectures obviously required it to be divided into sections of roughly uniform length. Even when presenting ms1 as a series of lectures, Russell did not adhere to the divisions that classroom presentation would have imposed: Lecture vi (“Why Did Leibniz Believe in an External World?”) is too short, and Lecture vii (“The Philosophy of Matter (a)”) too long. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that he delivered only seventeen lectures in 1899. But in changing the format from lectures to chapters, he seems to have felt free to go further in letting topic dictate length. It is clear that Russell did not conceive his Trinity lectures as treating a given number of topics in the philosophy of Leibniz, one lecture per topic, but as a single continuous argument, which might be divided in various ways for the listener’s or reader’s convenience.

Another example of his dividing his material for the convenience of the reader, this time at a very late stage in composition, is his division of the book first into sections numbered within each chapter (as indicated in the table of contents), and then into a single sequence for the whole book. Russell had so numbered the sections of An Essay on the Foundations of Geometry and would do it again in The Principles of Mathematics. The section numbers are not present in ms2. They must have been added to the typescript, for the single sequence is in the page proofs; moreover, the sections were not renumbered into a single sequence until after he had prepared the analytical table of contents in the front matter, where each section is described individually. In the ms of the appendix his section renumbering is evident throughout.

Internal evidence in Russell’s hand in ms2 at 109n.3 (fol. 174; see sec. 1) makes it plain that a typescript was prepared from the heavily revised ms2—presumably the typescript from which the book was set. Even without this single mention of the typescript, a text intermediate between ms2 and the proofs would have to be inferred, for there are numerous otherwise unaccountable discrepancies between ms2 and
the page proofs. (These are recorded in section III of the present article.) Apart from the first chapter and the front matter, $\textit{MS2}$ was not marked up for typesetting, nor does it show any signs of the sort of hard usage that printer's copy usually suffers. The same is not true of (1b), the appendix $\textit{MS}$, which is so neatly written out that it must have been intended to go direct to the publisher. It bears the Press’s sequential page numbering in pencil, a reference to another book’s housestyling, compositors’ names, the text for signature lines, and the name of the font in which to set the bold “G.” references.

The first chapter ($\textit{MS3}$) is different from the others: it, too, was marked up for composition. The printer dated the first leaf “April 2, ’00” and indicated that the book was to be formatted in the same way as Russell’s $\textit{Essay on the Foundations of Geometry}$ three years earlier. The chapter label for the first chapter is also different. Though the title is “Leibniz’s Premisses”, Russell used the letter “L.” as the chapter label, either because he had already used “LP” for the preface or simply to indicate that it belonged to the Leibniz book. The first chapter as published evidently replaced an earlier first chapter in $\textit{MS2}$ that was to have the title “Introductory” and presumably also in the typescript. Significantly, the first chapter is the one part of the book which differs in major ways from the actual lectures as recorded in Moore’s notes. Russell started the lectures with an account of Leibniz’s life, and it’s reasonable to suppose that his book originally began in the same way. Presumably the biographical material was suppressed because it was irrelevant to the book’s philosophical purpose and was readily available elsewhere.

In section 1 below, the textual notes report the alterations within the main $\textit{MS}$.\textsuperscript{11} After the page and line number of any printing of the first edition, the final $\textit{MS}$ reading is followed by a square bracket and the previous reading or whether the final $\textit{MS}$ reading was “inserted”. Complex alterations are described as “replaced”. Section 11 has a table of brief exchanges, with quoted context, between Moore and Russell on the former’s copy of the page proofs. In section 111, the collation of the main $\textit{MS}$, page proofs and first edition, the first reading—to the left of “PL]”—is the reading cited in any printing of the first edition.

\textsuperscript{11} O’BRIANT (p. 178) points to three $\textit{MS}$ deletions (86: 19, 87: 20, 117: 29–30), and (p. 185) to some changes after the proofs, but not the addition to the section (§105) on the $\textit{Characteristica Universalis}$, for which Russell came to respect Leibniz more highly.
"PP" refers to document (2), Moore’s set of page proofs; “MS” to MS2; and “PL37+” to the printings of 1937 and later.\textsuperscript{13}

I. ALTERATIONS WITHIN THE MAIN MANUSCRIPT

\textbf{Preface} [first edition pp. in brackets]

xi[v]: 3–4 mainly historical, while the second is mainly philosophical MS\textsuperscript{12} historical rather than philosophical, while the second is philosophical rather than historical (fol. 11)
xii[vi]: 5 find MS after deleted get
xii[vii]: 2 possible MS inserted
xii[vii]: 12–13 it may be doubted MS inserted
xii[vii]: 24 previous MS past (fol. 12)
xii[vii]: 4–5 is still MS above deleted remains
xii[vi]: 6 of MS above deleted part of
xii[vii]: 11 by learning MS after deleted a knowledge of the
xii[vii]: 19 what MS after deleted what (fol. 13)
xiii[vii]: 1–2 notably Professor Stein MS inserted
xiii[vii]: 4 Erdmann’s admirable account MS after deleted The best (fol. 14)
xiii[vii]: 5 (1842) MS inserted
xiii: 10 in the minds of commentators MS after deleted in peop
xiii[vii]: 13 book MS above deleted work
xiii[vii]: 18 the text MS replaced his text
xiii[vii]: 20–1 In the Lent term MS after deleted I was led to the study of his philosophy by a course of lec
xiv[viii]: 1 Leibniz’s MS above deleted his
xiv[viii]: 3 seemingly MS above deleted apparently (fol. 15)
xiv[viii]: 11 theory MS above deleted doctrine (fol. 16)
xiv[viii]: 20 , wherever one could be found, MS inserted
xiv[viii]: 22 quotations MS after deleted passages
xiv[viii]: 23–4 I have given the date of a passage whenever it is not later than 1686, or seems important for some other reason. MS inserted
xiv[viii]: 27–8 but passages quoted in the text are in general not repeated in the Appendix. MS inserted
xiv[viii]: 30 contained in it MS replaced quoted in the appendix (fol. 17)
xiv[viii]: 31 by the reference MS inserted
xiv[viii]: 32–3 nowhere assumed any knowledge of a foreign language. MS before deleted or of other writings of Leibn
xv[ix]: 2 him MS above deleted Mr. Latta
xv[ix]: 5 followed MS after deleted as far as possible
xv[ix]: 8 , Cambridge, MS inserted

\textbf{Table of Contents}

xvii[xi]: 3 Chapter I Leibniz’s Premisses MS Chapter I. Introductory (fol. 2)
xviii[xi]: 18 with the identity MS replaced the identity

\textbf{Abbreviations}

xxiii[xvii]: 16 Langley MS after deleted Brown

\textbf{Chapter I}

1: 6 views MS above deleted works (fol. 24)
1: 13 than MS after deleted that
1: 19 rival MS inserted

\textsuperscript{12} Corrctions in PL37+ are recorded in sec. III at 141: 11, 145: 15 and 178: 23.

\textsuperscript{13} We gratefully acknowledge Arlene Duncan’s drafting of textual notes from Moore’s “X” comments on his set of page proofs (he put “a little cross of ink” where he “saw reason to suggest an actual correction”) and Brandon Wooldridge’s collation of a photocopy of a later impression of the first edition with the main MS.
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1: 26 readers MS] inserted (fol. 22)
2: 7–8 modern students, such as MS] inserted
2: 8 or Gerhardt. MS] before deleted or
2: 11 cause MS] above deleted ground
2n.: MS] inserted
2: 22 laborious researches MS] after deleted the (fol. 23)
2: 28–30 combined to prevent Leibniz from doing himself justice in a connected exposition of his system. MS] (these lines at the top of fol. 24/3a (renumbered from 3) must have belonged to the previous draft:)
2: 35 Plato’s Dialogues. MS] before deleted
6n.2: MS] inserted (because written at foot of leaf instead of inline)
6n.3: MS] inserted
6n.4: MS] inserted (fol. 32)
6: 26 He spent MS] after deleted
6: 28 laws of motion and the MS] inserted
6n.5: MS] replaced
6: 25 learnt to know the greatest MS] replaced became acquainted with the chief
6: 26 He spent MS] after deleted With
6: 28 laws of motion and the MS] inserted
6n.6: MS] inserted
6: 25 learnt to know the greatest MS] replaced became acquainted with the chief
6: 26 He spent MS] after deleted With
6: 28 laws of motion and the MS] inserted
6n.1: MS] inserted
6n.2: MS] inserted
6: 25 learnt to know the greatest MS] replaced became acquainted with the chief
6: 26 He spent MS] after deleted
6: 28 laws of motion and the MS] inserted
8: 21 is MS] after deleted which
8: 27 drawn MS] after deleted taken
9: 10 points MS] after deleted questions
9: 12 in question, MS] inserted (fol. 33)
9: 13 three MS] written over two
9: 23 logically MS] after deleted evidently
9: 31 predicate MS] after deleted notion of the
10: 4 many MS] above deleted several (fol. 30)
10: 9 their MS] inserted
10: 11 no one MS] after deleted they are

Chapter II
8n.1: MS] inserted (fol. 34)
8n.2: MS] inserted
8: 21 is MS] after deleted which
8: 27 drawn MS] after deleted taken
9: 10 points MS] after deleted questions
9: 12 in question, MS] inserted (fol. 33)
9: 13 three MS] written over two
9: 23 logically MS] after deleted evidently
9: 31 predicate MS] after deleted notion of the
10: 4 many MS] above deleted several (fol. 30)
10: 9 their MS] inserted
10: 11 no one MS] after deleted they are
I. Alterations within the Main Manuscript

not ea cannot be inferred one from another

10: 21–2 The need of such reasons is the principle of sufficient reason. MS inserted

10: 22 Subjects whose MS replaced Such subjects,

10: 23 are MS after deleted illegible word beginning I

10: 28 substance MS above deleted subject

11: 10 he MS inserted

11: 13 empirical premiss MS replaced two empirical premisses

12: 13 , moreover, MS inserted (fol. 38/4; fol. 39)

12: 24–5 a predicate to each of the subjects. MS replaced each of the subjects a predicate.

12: 31 part. MS before deleted etc.

12: 33 As regards MS replaced But as regards (fol. 40)

14: 24 the Kantian theory MS replaced deduce the Kantian doctrine (fol. 42)

14: 27 special MS after deleted the various

14: 31 deduction MS in pencil above deleted proof

14: 33 relational MS inserted

15: 7–8, on the other hand, be truly a proposition, MS replaced be true, on the other hand,

15: 8–9 propositions MS after deleted true

15: 13–14 there is no reason to suppose the truth dependent upon MS replaced the truth is distinct from his perception of it

15: 18–19 relation. MS before deleted , express (fol. 43)

15: 33 in respect of belief in MS above deleted as to

16: 2 more difficult MS after deleted equally (fol. 44)

16: 4–5 and their relation to necessity MS inserted

16: 8–9 an account of MS inserted

16: 11 meaning and MS inserted

16: 26–17: 16 *As regards the range of analytic judgments ... *The notion that all à priori truths are analytic is MS inserted as chapter fol. 10a, replacing *As regards the meaning of analytic judgments, this meaning is (fol. 49)

16: 31–2, as I shall show in the next chapter, MS inserted

16: 36–7 some of the instances which Leibniz suggests. MS replaced some instances of what Leibniz considers to be immediately analytic evident, and suitable as premisses. 

17: 3 (N. E. p. 404; G. V. 343) MS inserted

17: 20 one or more of which are one of which is (fol. 45)

17: 21–3 Thus Leibniz, as we have just seen, gives as an instance the proposition: “The equilateral rectangle is a rectangle” (N. E. p. 405; G. V. 343). MS inserted, with G. V. 403 as an insertion within and with , as we have just seen, as typescript or proof insertion

17: 27 of MS inserted

17: 30 human MS above deleted wise (fol. 46)

18: 5 If, however, MS replaced Or rather, since

18: 5 be deemed MS above deleted seems
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18: 6–7 we shall have to say that MS] inserted
18: 9 proposition MS] after deleted inde
18: 13 ; G. v. 428 MS] inserted
18: 15 evidently MS] after deleted is
18: 25 (predictability being here of the first type) MS] inserted (fol. 47)
19: 4 Monadology, §§ MS] replaced Mon.
19: 12 ; G. VI. 612 MS] inserted
19: 16–17 that the "primary principles" are identical or analytic MS] above deleted of analytic judgments
19: 26 ; G. V. 343 MS] inserted
19: 34 (G. VII. 261) MS] inserted in brackets
19n.1: (1676) MS] inserted
20: 5 necessarily MS] above deleted ultimately
20: 10 Hence MS] Thus
20: 12–13 there is always involved, in definition MS] after deleted in definition
20: 21 two MS] inserted (fol. 49)
20: 26 ; G. V. 343 MS] inserted
21: 9 , as defined by Leibniz, MS] inserted
21: 12 Thus Leibniz’s criterion MS] after deleted two propositions, again, involve the propositions that there are such concepts as square and circle. (fol. 50)
21: 19 other, MS] before inserted and deleted [Cf. G. VII. 261] [Proof of God for Spinoza.]
21: 35 the opposite view MS] after deleted this
22: 8 argument; MS] before deleted [Cf. Kant, ed. Hart. I. p. 21 ff] and Kant, while still a Leibnizian, rightly rejected the necessity of three dimensions. (see 22: 13 for use of reference to Kant)
22: 33 ; G. V. 92 MS] inserted (fol. 57)
23: 14 metaphysical necessity, which is here in question, MS] replaced necessity (fol. 52)
23: 29–30 and by his strict determinism, MS] inserted
23: 32 (For Leibniz, MS] written over [In Leibniz, 23: 38 that MS] above deleted which (fol. 53)
24: 12 with MS] above deleted between
24: 20 , however, MS] inserted
24: 23 destroy MS] after deleted show

Chapter III
25: 1 MS] (no chapter head or number; fol. 54)
25: 10 propositions MS] after deleted the divis
25: 17 classification, MS] above deleted principle
25: 22–3 the necessary existence of God, MS] replaced God’s existence, which is necessary,
26: 15 , of course, MS] inserted (fol. 55)
26: 17 propositions about MS] inserted
27: 10 applications MS] above deleted cases (fol. 56)
27: 12 the further MS] replaced this further
27: 17 necessary or contingent, past, present, or future, MS] replaced past, present, or future, necessary or contingent, (fol. 57)
27: 30 the contrary MS] above deleted existence to be a predicate
27: 32 denial MS] before deleted of this assertion
27n.: MS] inserted
27n.: joined MS] after deleted connected with
28: 16 a MS] inserted (fol. 58)
28: 33 laws, MS] replaced general laws are of the nature of empirical generalizations (fol. 59; fol. 60)
31: 13 statement PL] enunciation MS (fol. 61; fol. 62)
31: 13 veritable MS] after deleted correct
32: 25 Even MS] inserted in pencil (fol. 63; fol. 64)
32: 27 and any true MS] after deleted not only of a
32: 30 than in later years, MS] inserted
33: 4–5 every truth has its à priori proof PL] everything truth has its à priori proof MS] replaced every truth has its à priori reason (every replaced everything)
I. Alterations within the Main Manuscript

33: 7 (G. II. 62). MS] before deleted These statements, as they stand, seem very different from the (last word already deleted) Leibniz’s ordinary account of the principle. But it would seem 33: 13 help MS] above deleted means (fol. 65) 33: 25 itself MS] inserted 34: 2 Leibniz’s MS] above deleted his 34: 5 also written in 1686, MS] replaced written seven months before the above (fol. 66) 34: 17 only MS] inserted 34: 26 will MS] inserted 35: 7 meaning MS] after deleted bearing (fol. 67) 35: 29–30 a letter to the Princess of Wales, accompanying MS] inserted (fol. 68) 35: 36 have been MS] after deleted also 36n.: the conception of a MS] inserted before a possible cause (fol. 69) 36: 28–9 This is the essence of activity, MS] replaced This is the essence of the doctrine of activity, 37: 27 exist MS] inserted (fol. 70) 38: 5 causal connections do not really connect MS] after deleted they do not (fol. 71) 38: 8 must MS] above deleted may 38: 24 effect MS] after deleted end 38: 26 what MS] replaced the (fol. 72) 38: 29 any possible MS] replaced the possible 39: 8 remedy MS] above deleted escape 39n.: MS] (at head of leaf: Footnote end of Chap. III) (fol. 73)

Chapter IV
40: 1 Chapter MS] above deleted Lecture (fol. 74) 40: 18 in MS] above deleted to 40: 19–20 not so obscure as that philosopher thought it MS] replaced not obscure 40: 20 ; G. V. 132 MS] inserted 40: 24 ; G. IV. 469 MS] inserted 40: 26 of MS] written over to (fol. 75) 41: 7–8 or “that which is in itself and is conceived through itself. Substance, to him, MS] inserted after and (no closing quotes) 41: 8–10 a remedy which Leibniz regarded as condemning the original definition (G. VI. 582). MS] inserted 41: 14 not MS] before deleted really 41: 21–42: 6 ¶There is … (Ib. 585–6). MS] inserted as fol. 76 41: 38 may involve MS] replaced involves 42: 6 (Ib. 582) MS] inserted 42: 7 , however, MS] inserted (fol. 77) 42: 9 existence.* MS] (inserted and then deleted note: See Dialogue between Philarète and Ariste, G. VI. 579–594, for criticism of Malebranche’s definition of substance. (followed by: [See 3a.]) 42: 13–15 the words support or substratum, which Locke is using as synonymous with substance, mean MS] replaced the word means 42: 15 ; G. V. 201–2 MS] inserted 42: 35 G. II. 43 MS] inserted (fol. 78) 43: 6 made a subject. MS] before inserted and deleted [Cf. G. II. 457] (11e) (slightly expanded G. reference reappears at 43: 9) 43: 8–9 The ultimate subject is always a substance (G. II. 457–8). MS] inserted 43: 9 Thus the term I MS] replaced in pencil at first The term I, on the other hand 43: 10 attribution to any other term; MS] replaced in pencil at first such attribution 43: 13 states MS] above deleted predicates 43: 15 which he denies, MS] inserted, initially as which Leibniz denies, 43: 16 predicate. MS] before deleted But in this case, Leibniz holds that what is real about space is not space as it appears, but predicates 43: 21–2 any attribute exists only at a certain time MS] replaced the attributes exist only at certain times (fol. 79) 43: 22–3 its being an attribute at that time MS] replaced their being attributes at those times 43: 24 subject MS] inserted 43: 33 G. II. 46, 47 MS] replaced G. II. 46
succession of states ought not to be assumed to begin with, but to be
deduced as a result of their differing
qualities. By means of activity, this is to
some extent effected. Activity makes a
difference of quality. MS (fol. 85; simi-
lar text reappears on fol. 91)

47: 23 given MS] inserted (fol. 88)
47: 25 Lotze’s MS] above deleted the
47n.: MS] inserted
47: 30 remaining MS] inserted
48: 6 of the MS] inserted
48: 7 ; G. II. 136 MS] inserted
48: 15 preceding MS] above deleted
previous (fol. 87/11)
48: 19 , respectively, MS] inserted
48: 22 For MS] inserted
48: 28–9 I wish to point out MS] replaced
I wish you to observe
48: 30 stage, MS] in pencil above deleted
point,
48: 33 follows. MS] follows. (with deleted
instruction below:) [Return to p. 9.]
49: 2 series of perpetually new terms.
MS] replaced series prolonged through-
out all time. (fol. 88)
49: 2–3 still have been simple substances,
in the sense of independent causal se-
ries, but there would MS] inserted, at
first in pencil
49: 5 one of these simple substances MS]
inserted, at first in pencil, after deleted a
single substance
49: 9 independent MS] inserted
49: 13 predicates. MS] (instruction:) [In-
sert p. 12a] [Footnote]
49n.1: action, MS] after deleted substanc
49n.1: I hold that MS] inserted
49n.1: is also reciprocal MS] after deleted
may be inverted
50: 3 ; G. V. 201–3; esp. § 2 MS] inserted
(fol. 90)
50n.1: 43, MS] inserted
50: 24–6 while the judgment that a
substance exists would not be one
judgment, but as many judgments as
the subject has temporal predicates.
MS] inserted, temporal being added after
page proofs
I. Alterations within the Main Manuscript

51: 11 pretended predicate, MS] before deleted, (fol. 91)
51: 13 predicate. MS] predicate before deleted: [Insert p. 12a (fol. 92)]
52: 5 activity or MS] inserted (fol. 92; fol. 93)
52: 27 contains traces of MS] replaced contains traces replaced involves references to (fol. 94)
53: 5–6 will appear, as regards space, MS] replaced as regards space, will appear
56: 16 proposition MS] above deleted thing
56: 19 concludes MS] above deleted prefaces
56: 21 ; G. VII. 372 MS] inserted
56: 26–8 And it is difficult to be sure how great a reservation is implied by the words “in abstract terms.” MS] inserted
56: 31 seems to presuppose MS] replaced presupposes
57: 1–2 Where difference of place appears there must be MS] replaced Thus where there is difference of place there must also be (fol. 98)
57: 5 at the same time MS] inserted
57: 5–6 proposition logically subsequent to MS] replaced particular case of
57: 11 Leibniz MS] above deleted be
57: 23 also MS] inserted
57: 27 ; G. VII. 407 MS] inserted
57: 29 result MS] above deleted consequence (fol. 101)
57: 35 concerned MS] inserted
58n.: MS] inserted (instruction: [See p. 6a] (i.e. fol. 100)
58: 17–18 ; G. V. 268 MS] inserted (fol. 102)
58: 25 its MS] inserted
58: 27 involved in MS] above deleted which
59: 34 at all. MS] inserted
59n.: MS] inserted (fol. 103)
59: 13 collection of qualities MS] above deleted concepts
59: 17–60: 22 5But further … Mr Bradley’s Reality. MS] inserted (fol. 104)
59: 24 its MS] after deleted the
59: 33 substance MS] above deleted subject
60: 3 Even MS] inserted
60: 12 a MS] inserted
60: 18–22 As against many substances, we may urge, with Mr. Bradley, that all diversity must be of the diversity of meanings; as against one substance, we may urge that the same is true of identity. And this holds equally against the supposed self-identity of Mr. Bradley’s Reality. MS] inserted (see sec. 111)
61: 1 analysis of numbers ends with unity. MS replaced numbers with unity. (fol. 105)

61: 4 for us MS inserted

61: 8 & G. V. 268 MS inserted

61: 8–10 Necessary and contingent truths differ as rational numbers and surds. The resolution of the latter proceeds to infinity (G. VII. 309). MS inserted after deleted Again and above deleted This, he explains, is due to the influence (“understanding it healthfu

61: 11–20 ¶Again he says ¶accomplish.” MS inserted (fol. 106)

61: 26 the cause of Alexander’s death. MS replaced how Alexander died.

61n.: MS inserted (fol. 106)

62: 23 ultimately MS after deleted distinc-

62: 24 necessary MS above deleted other

62: 25 not only mean MS after deleted That he does (fol. 105)

62: 26 explain. MS replaced explain, is evident from the fact that he uses the notion of contingency to prove that God’s acts are free.

62: 5 suggested MS above deleted explicitly urged (fol. 107)

62: 38 making MS after deleted between

63: 4 & G. V. 287–8 MS inserted

63: 19–20 The infinite complexity of sub-

63: 28 or of forms MS inserted, like other recent insertions, in pencil first and written over in ink

64: 7 Jumps MS] replaced A jump (fol. 109)

64: 19 & G. III. 51–55 MS inserted

64: 24–5 & G. III. 52 MS inserted

64: 29 in constant use MS] replaced used with great effect (fol. 110)

65: 3–4 G. II. 168 MS before deleted N. E. pp. 50–51

65: 4–5 N. E. p. 51; G. V. 49–50 MS] & G. V. 49–50 inserted

65: 18–19 And this is why Leibniz remarks parenthetically (N. E. 51; G. V. 51) that he has à priori reasons for his view. MS inserted before instruction: [Insert here the 2nd § of p. 14] (fol. 111)

65: 20–66: 4 ¶Why Leibniz … Leibniz’s mind. MS inserted (fol. 112)

65n.2: MS inserted, followed by deleted (8a)

66: 5 ¶The continuity MS after deleted It is diff (fol. 111)

66: 13–14 ; cf. also G. II. 41 MS inserted with cf. also above deleted Quote

66: 23–4 no one order contains) their or-

66: 24 ; G. V. 286 MS inserted before instruction: [Continue with p. 15]

67: 7 contingent MS inserted (fol. 113)

67: 19 principal MS after deleted principle (fol. 114)

68: 1 principal MS inserted (fol. 115)

68: 1 all MS inserted

68: 17 while space and motion MS re-

68: 23 one MS] inserted

68: 29 number and MS] inserted

69: 25 with MS] inserted (fol. 116)

69n.: MS] inserted

Chapter VI

70: 1 Chapter MS] above deleted Lecture

70: 4 the nature of MS] after deleted what is (fol. 117)

70: 13 apparently were MS] above deleted seem to have been

70: 17 VII, 377; IV. 478 and L. 300; MS] inserted

70: 24–6 Leibniz, whose ontology begins with Dynamics, which it gradually transforms into psychology, was less philosophical than Bishop Berkeley. MS replaced Berkeley was more philosophical than Leibniz, whose (whose after deleted nevertheless) ontology begins with Dynamics, which it gradually transforms into psychology.

71: 8–10 Though scattered remarks in his later writings seem in agreement with these two papers, MS inserted (fol. 118)

71: 13 its existence MS] above deleted this 14–32 & nn. This view … discrete.
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MS inserted (fol. 119)
71: 15 L. 300; G. IV. 478. Cf. also L. 351–2. MS cf. also L. 351–2. inserted
71: 17 view MS above deleted theory
71: 24 mathematical MS after deleted the
71: 26 units, MS after deleted unities,
71: 34 with which MS inserted (fol. 118)
72: 8 , he says, MS inserted
72: 13 ; G. VII. 320 MS inserted (fol. 120)
72: 16–17 that there is no “exact demon-
72n. G. V. 275, 355–6; VII. 320–321; MS inserted with
719 switched from 1st to 3rd position at start
73: 4–6 “The argument by which Des
73: 6 would have been MS were
73: 9 G. IV. 367; MS inserted
73: 9 V. 275; MS inserted
73: 10–23 †There is … great extent. MS inserted (fol. 122)
73: 12 truth MS above deleted veracity
73: 21 consistent MS after deleted relia
73: 24 other MS inserted (fol. 121)
73: 25 commonly MS inserted
73: 32–74: 20 ¶The ground … their place.
MS inserted (fol. 123)
73: 33 is MS after deleted seems to have been
73: 35 D. 102, 103; L. 340, 341; G. VII. 303, 304 PL D. 102, 103; G. VII. 303, 304 MS ; G. VII. 303, 304 inserted
73n.: MS inserted
74: 35 Chapters MS above deleted lectures
74n.: MS inserted on fol. 123
74n.: G. IV. 495 MS inserted

Chapter VII
75: 1 Chapter MS above deleted Lecture (fol. 124)
75: 7 chapter MS above deleted lecture
75: 16 succeeding MS in pencil above pencil deletion following
75: 16 chapters MS above deleted lectures
75: 18 the chief criticism MS after deleted
1 wish you to remember that
75: 23 or MS above deleted and
75: 25 readers MS above deleted you (fol. 125)
75: 25 he uses MS inserted
75: 25–6 matter and body MS before de-
leted are used by Leibniz
75: 28 employed MS above deleted used
76: 14 and Leibniz’s correctness MS replaced and it is a test of Leibniz’s cor-
rectness
76: 20 chapter MS above deleted lecture (fol. 126)
76: 26 chapter MS above deleted lecture
76: 35 N. E. p. 722 and VII, 501 MS N.
E. p. 722 and inserted
76: 37 pair of MS inserted
76: 38 second pair MS replaced second two
76: 38 constitutes MS above deleted is
76: 39 chapters. PL] lectures. MS
77: 1 mass or MS inserted
77: 1–2 , with the dominant monad, MS inserted
77: 7 Dynamics MS after deleted matter (fol. 127)
77: 10 force is proportional to quantity of motion. MS replaced there is no need
of an ultimate conception of force in ad-
dition to motion.
77: 26 formed MS after deleted called for
77n:1: MS inserted in place of , a work
which called forth an epigram from
Lessing.
77: 28 To Leibniz and his contemporar-
ies, MS inserted
77: 29 something MS inserted
77n:2: MS inserted
78: 19 G. VII. 328 MS inserted (fol. 128; fol. 129)
78: 21 a MS inserted
78: 22 cannot MS above deleted can’t (fol. 121)
78: 23–4 does not MS replaced doesn’t
78: 25–6 are uniform MS above deleted equal
79: 3–18 Thus Leibniz … G. M. VI. 236). MS inserted (fol. 130/6a; insertion to have been made first at 79: 26)
79: 5 matter MS] above deleted power
79: 8 motion.” MS] before deleted And by which it comes about that
79: 27 part of MS] inserted (fol. 135)
80n.2: is no less MS] replaced would be as (see sec. 117; fol. 132)
80n.2: subject” MS] before deleted
I have already said something about it above.
81: 4 inferring MS] inserted (fol. 133)
81: 12 perfectly elastic MS] inserted (with
81: 25 occasionalism MS] after deleted this
81: 28 every collection of MS] inserted
81: 30 all MS] inserted
81: 32 the form of a polemic MS] replaced a polemical form (fol. 134)
81: 35–82: 3 The two measures (N. E. 675; G. M. VI. 239). MS] inserted
82: 9 in any independent system; MS] inserted (fol. 134)
82: 19–21 ¶As this point is important, it may be well briefly to repeat the arguments which show the relativity of motion to be inconsistent with the absoluteness of force. MS] replaced
This point may be substantiated by examining the connection of force with the relativity of motion.
82: 7 Let us MS] above deleted We are to
83: 2–3 a later chapter MS] (“chapter” suggests this leaf not written for lectures)
83: 3 of force MS] inserted (fol. 136)
83: 8 so-called MS] inserted
83: 35 was a main purpose of MS] inserted (fol. 137)
84: 25 space MS] after deleted place (fol. 138/12)
84: 33 and MS] inserted after deleted and
85: 5 is MS] before deleted extremely
85: 13 He and Huygens agree MS] He before deleted age (fol. 139)
85: 18–20 The Copernican hypothesis, Leibniz says, anticipating Mach, is simpler, not truer, than the other [N. E. 685]. MS] inserted
85: 29 of MS] inserted
85: 36–86: 4 Again he says ... [D. 269]. MS] inserted (fol. 140)
86: 6 reconciled MS] after deleted held (fol. 141)
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89: 28–9 all-pervading fluid. PL] all-pervading fluid—or rather, of all pervading fluids, for three were needed in his theory (Wundt op. cit. p. 30; Tentamen de motuum coelestium causis, G. M. VI.). MS] (deleted in PP; see this note in sec. 111; fol. 146)

90: 10–22 Again he says … (G. III. 57). MS] (fol. 148)

90: 39–91: 1, from his love of a middle position, MS] inserted (fol. 147; fol. 149)

91: 4 by Huygens. MS] before deleted His relational theory of space, and his whole doctrine of monads

91n.1: MS] inserted

91: 21 in later life MS] before deleted at any rate (fol. 150)

91: 26 personal MS] inserted in pencil (fol. 151)

92: 10 is impossible, MS] inserted (fol. 152)

92: 12 Again MS] after deleted Moreover

92: 26 D. 240, 253 MS] 240, inserted

93: 5 be MS] inserted in pencil (fol. 152)

93: 24–5 on Leibniz’s system MS] inserted (see sec. 111)

94: 13 brings MS] after deleted is the (fol. 154)

94: 6 Chapter MS] (“chapter” and footnote on leaf suggest leaf was rewritten, despite roman numeral in upper left corner)

94n.2: MS] inserted

94: 17 D. 122 MS] inserted in square brackets

95: 23 Every body, MS] ¶ inserted before Every (fol. 155)

94: 23, we are told, MS] inserted

94: 32 particle of matter, MS] after deleted state of a body,

95: 4 N. E. 673 MS] after deleted Archi

95: 6 spontaneously MS] above deleted perpetually

95: 18 absolute MS] inserted

95: 19–96: 20 at length … G. IV. 396). MS] in handwriting of Alys Russell except for last sentence on fol. 158: In this argument, it must be evident that, so far from basing metaphysics upon Dynamics, Leibniz has inferred, on purely metaphysical grounds, a primitive force of which no dynamical use is made. (fols. 156–159)


96: 11 Vis Viva, MS] inserted (fol. 157)

96: 13 (G. III. 457) MS] before deleted and

96: 24 What was useful PL] instruction: [Same ¶] What was useful MS] (fol. 158; fol. 159)

96: 30 as MS] after deleted the

97: 27 this standpoint, which is MS] replaced this diametrically opposite standpoint

97: 34 which renders MS] from which

97: 34 which MS] after deleted from with

98: 21 every MS] above deleted no (fol. 160; fol. 161)

98: 33 causation MS] inserted

99: 6–7 find to be the case with MS] above deleted see that (fol. 162)

99: 10 chapters MS] (yet roman numeral for chapter no. in upper left corner)

Chapter VIII

100: 1 Chapter MS] above deleted Lecture (fol. 163)

100: 4 central MS] after deleted very central

100: 7 To MS] after deleted The

100: 8 one MS] above deleted the

100: 11 Mr. MS] inserted

100: 14 one of the two chief MS] above deleted the

100: 20 mastered MS] above deleted understood

100: 21 understood. MS] after deleted dealt with

100: 22 chapter MS] above deleted lecture

101: 1 in MS] above deleted concerning

101: 1 to point out MS] you to observe

101: 2 the following MS] inserted (fol. 164)

101: 7 presuppositions, MS] inserted

101: 9 inquire MS] above deleted observe

101: 23 rather MS] above deleted more or less

101: 24 fully MS] inserted

101: 26 His MS] written over The

101: 28 notion MS] above deleted idea

102: 2 among which are MS] inserted
Chapter IX

108: 1 Chapter MS] above deleted Lecture (fol. 172)
108: 3–5 ¶In the last chapter, we saw that matter is a phenomenon, resulting from aggregates of real unities or monads. Extension is repetition, and the extended is therefore plural. MS] inserted, with lecture number and title, at head of what was continuation of Chapter VIII; note at head on Cohen used in 109n.1
108: 3 chapter MS] above deleted lecture
108: 6 But MS] preceded by [Same ¶]
108: 7 extended MS] after deleted dis
108: 11–12 Leibniz, in admitting it, is MS] replaced in admitting it, Leibniz
108: 14 his MS] above deleted Leibniz’s
108: 21 somewhere MS] inserted
108: 23 that things are to be conceived MS] above deleted to consider the matter
108: 24–109: 3 Again … labyrinth.”1 MS] inserted (fol. 172 [with calculations on verso])
109n.1: Infinitesimalmethode, MS] p. 64; G. M. VII. 323? (title inserted)
109: 5 nearly MS] above deleted about (fol. 171)
109: 14 author MS] after deleted divine
109: 25 , strictly speaking, MS] inserted (fol. 173)
109: 28 is anterior to all composition, and is not formed by the addition of parts MS] replaced has no parts
109nn.1–3: MS] where 2 notes were indicated, 3 were made; there are instructions to [Quote D. 97] and [Insert p. 2a]; both took place in n.3 with references expanded
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109n.3: MS] instruction: [Directions: on p. 2, “N. E. p. 162; cf. G. II. 305” is to be typed as the beginning of a footnote, to continue as follows:] (fol. 174)

110n.: MS] note inserted as fol. 175 (recto) replacing fol. 176 (verso of same leaf): [Footnote, end of p. 2] ¶The argument may be put thus: Matter is extended. Thesis: Owing to infinite divisibility, the parts of what is extended are always extended. Antithesis: Since extension means repetition, the parts of what is extended must be ultimately unextended. Synthesis: Reality is not composed of extended matter, but consists of infinite unextended simple substances. Here thesis and antithesis are false, since there is nothing really extended; and for the same reason they are inconsistent with the synthesis. Nevertheless, the infinite plurality of the synthesis only results from supposing some element of truth to be contained in both thesis and antithesis. These are the characteristics of a dialectical argument. (fol. 176)

110: 9 defended MS] advocated (fol. 173)
110: 17–19 he often seems to imply, as we have already seen in connection with extension, MS] as we have already seen above deleted Leibniz often seems to imply 110: 20 the present question MS] above deleted this point 110: 22 bear a close analogy to MS] above deleted be best described as 110: 24 inferred MS] above deleted deduced 110: 25 inconsistent with each other MS] before deleted and with the result, followed by: [Insert footnote, p. 2b (11on., fol. 177).]
11on.: MS] inserted (fol. 177)
11on.: Now MS] But
111: 10 he MS] Leibniz (fol. 177)
111n.1: MS] inserted
111n.2: MS] inserted
111: 32 fractions MS] the fractions (fol. 178)
111: 34–112: 1 Similarly one half, abstractly taken, is a mere ratio, not the sum of two quarters; the latter is only true of numbered things (G. IV. 491). MS] inserted

112: 5 (G. IV. 491) MS] inserted
112: 10–12 It is the confusion of the ideal and the actual, Leibniz says again, which has embroiled everything, and produced the labyrinth of the continuum. MS] inserted
112: 13–114: 8 60. At this point … which is extended’. MS] inserted as fos. 179–180 (at top of fol. 179, in pencil and deleted in ink: D. pp. 265–267, § 47 (5th letter to Clarke). D. reference is used at 120: 35 and in Appendix)
112: 16 something MS] above deleted much (fol. 179)
112: 21, and even the other integers, are MS] above deleted is 112: 22 a similar MS] above deleted the same 112: 30 possible MS] inserted 112: 30–1 an extension which extends MS] replaced the extension of a body whose extension extends 112: 8 in MS] above deleted of 113: 11–12 and, in the end, just as self-contradictory as Newton’s. MS] inserted (fol. 180)
113: 12–13 A theory free from both these defects is much to be desired, MS] replaced If any of you can suggest a theory free from both these defects, I shall be glad to consider it,
113: 15 my next chapter. MS] above deleted a later lecture.
113: 15 to point out MS] replaced you to observe 113: 17 by Lotze and others MS] replaced though I think less clearly, by Lotze and all others 113: 19–20 occupied by MS] inserted
113: 24 He says, what suffices for me, that in space and time there are no divisions but such as are made by the mind [G. II. 278–9]. MS] inserted
113: 30 part of MS] inserted
113: 37 parts MS] after deleted illegible word
114: 8 extended’. MS] before deleted
extended. [cf. D. 270] (33b) It was inserted instead
114: 9 The MS] written over This
114: 10 thus MS] inserted (fol. 178)
114: 11 means MS] before deleted, for example,
114: 13 76 MS] inserted
114: 15 Mathematical MS] inserted
114: 16 possible MS] inserted
114: 16 for MS] after deleted of
114: 27 whole MS] inserted
114n.: MS] inserted as fol. 184/6a
114: 30–115:1 account of Leibniz MS] lectures (fol. 182, following 178)
114n.: follows MS] after deleted goes after
115: 2 a result MS] replaced an outcome
115: 4 is MS] after deleted may be
115: 4–5 The reality of what appears as matter is MS] above deleted This
115: 15 part MS] after deleted whole is pr
115: 17 indivisible MS] after deleted the
115: 26 completely MS] inserted
115: 31–2 what Leibniz calls semi-mental (G. III. 304) MS] above deleted something purely mental (fol. 183)
115: 36 “real beings” MS] above deleted “purely ideal things”
115: 39 161; PL] 161 and MS
116: 3 only verbally a whole (G. II. 305) MS] replaced not a whole
116: 4 per se MS] inserted
116: 5 semi-mental. MS] before inserted and deleted rather [Insert p. 8a]
116: 5–21 In most passages … (N. E. 149; G. V. 133). MS] inserted as (fol. 184/8a)
116: 11 separate MS] after deleted dispar
116: 17 single MS] inserted
116: 27 many MS] after deleted other (fol. 183)
116: 30 separate MS] inserted
116: 30 the perception of it MS] replaced perception
116: 34 every monad MS] replaced all the monads
116: 35 such MS] after deleted their
116: 36–7 a multitude in a unity MS] replaced multitude in unity
117: 5 then MS] inserted (fol. 185)
117: 10 is MS] inserted
117: 25 three MS] written over two
117: 26 my first chapter MS] replaced my first lecture (see sec. 111)
117: 26 three MS] written over two
117: 27 that all MS] after deleted the doctrine
117: 28–9 perception gives knowledge of a world not myself or my predicates, MS] replaced perception is in general trustworthy.
117: 29–30 logical subject. MS] before deleted That previous philosophers had not arrived at the same dilemma, was not due to their greater merit, but to their smaller consistency. Leibniz’s error was one involved in all previous philosophies, and concealed in them only by subsequent errors and by failure to work out necessary results in detail.
117: 29–30 (3) that the Ego is an ultimate logical subject. MS] inserted

Chapter X
118: 4–5 the preceding chapter, the nature of Leibniz’s theory of space and time MS] my last lecture, what Leibniz’s theory of space and time was (fol. 186)
118: 5 wish to examine, in this chapter, MS] replaced have to examine, today,
118n.: in his M. MS] replaced in M, being incapable of Leibniz’s thorough-going consistency.
118: 20 space MS] before deleted and time
118: 21 substances MS] after deleted spaces and times
118: 21 and the spaces MS] before deleted and times
118: 25 space MS] before deleted or time (fol. 187)
119: 2 room. MS] after deleted place.
119: 6 which MS] after deleted in
119: 15 his MS] above deleted Leibniz’s
119: 17 D. 252; G. VII. 376–7 PL] D. 252 MS
119: 22–3 theory is designed MS] above deleted sought
119n.: MS] inserted
119: 23 be MS] is
119: 23 Leibniz MS] he
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119: 26 What, MS] after deleted It is su
119: 34–5 Against regarding space as an attribute, the real argument is, MS] The real (real inserted) argument against regarding space as an attribute is] after deleted This argument (fol. 188)
119: 36–8 Against regarding space as a substance, or independent existent, Leibniz's favourite argument is MS] Leibniz's favourite argument against regarding space as a substance, or independent existent, is
120: 2 Space Ms] after deleted For
120: 3 uniform, MS] inserted
120: 15 chapter MS] above deleted
120: 15–16, if they are real, MS] inserted
120: 20–2 And as … exist MS] possibly inserted
120: 21 it, MS] it (D. 268),
120: 24 From that MS] after deleted For them (fol. 189)
120: 34 Time, again, is a being of reason exactly as much as space, but co-pre-and post-existence are something real (G. II. 183). MS] inserted
120: 35–6 265–7 MS] (written over 266–8)
121: 1 precisely MS] inserted
121: 2 to that MS] inserted
121: 4 there is nothing MS] replaced nothing is
121: 15 same MS] inserted (fol. 190)
121: 16 the MS] inserted
121: 17 this MS] after deleted illegible insertion
121: 17–18, on his theory, is neither necessary nor possible. MS] replaced he has absolutely no right to.
121: 34 more MS] further
121: 37–8 are unable, owing to obvious facts MS] replaced, owing to obvious facts, are unable
122: 23 different points of view MS] above deleted an objective counterpart (fol. 191)
122: 30 occupying MS] inserted (fol. 192)
123: 5 appears MS] above deleted seems
123: 10 had proved the MS] above deleted saw the
123: 12 matter. MS] before deleted I can
123: 13 before his journey to Paris, MS] above deleted at this time,
123: 19 his proofs MS] mind consists properly in a point of space, whereas a body occupies a place his proofs (fol. 193/8)
123: 22 difficulties MS] above deleted questions
123: 22 solve MS] above deleted answer
123: 23 mind MS] after deleted body
123: 33 which reminds one MS] almost as gross as that
123: 34–6 The mind, he says, must be in the place of a concourse of all motions which are impressed by objects of sense (G. I. 53). MS] inserted
124: 9 expression MS] before deleted mathema (fol. 194)
124: 13–14 seen in perspective MS] above deleted photographed
124: 15–16 to what it is analogous MS] replaced what it is analogous to
124n.2: without disapproval MS] replaced with evident approval
125: 17 assigned to MS] above deleted derived from
125: 38–126: 7 This preposterous … the multitude1. MS] inserted as fol. 197
126n.1: hence MS] above deleted thus
126: 6 unité MS] replaced units
126: 8 of immediate presence in a volume MS] inserted (fol. 196)
126: 19 are not MS] above deleted is one space (fol. 198)
126: 21 is not only MS] (after deleted illegible word) is not only
127: 4 Time, MS] Concerning time, or
127: 16 events MS] after deleted other
127: 21 Nor can we say MS] But we can-not say either
127: 22 since MS] after deleted for
127: 26–7 D. 281 MS] inserted
127: 28–9 which actually occur MS]
inserted (fol. 200)

128: 1 presence in one position in space is MS replaced successive positions in space are
128: 2–3 from presence at the position next occupied. MS inserted
128: 5, in the usual acceptation of the words MS inserted
128: 13 spatial MS after deleted chan
128: 14–15 occupied. Exactly the same argument will apply to change in general, and a state of motion or change MS replaced occupied; and a state of motion
128: 16 absolutely MS after deleted never
128n.: MS inserted with Cf. G. IV. 513.

129: 1 I come now to the proper subject of this lecture, the description MS
129: 2 I endeavoured to prove, in my last lecture, giving to the relations among perceptions that counterpart, in the objects of perception, MS replaced giving that counterpart, in the objects of perception, to the relations among perceptions themselves
129: 4 and time MS inserted
129: 5 74. It would thus appear MS replaced Lecture XI. | The Nature of Monads in General. | ¶I endeavoured to prove, in my last lecture, (fol. 202/16)
129: 6–7 which, according to Leibniz, is on a level with geometrical proofs (G. II. 295), MS inserted (fol. 202)
129: 9 argument MS replaced favourite argument
130: 7 it MS above deleted they (fol. 204)
130: 14 he MS after deleted Leibniz
130: 18 between MS above deleted being
130: 23 fact MS above deleted case

Chapter XI
131: 1 Chapter MS (Despite the roman chapter no., Lecture does not appear in title but does on 1st line.)
131: 3 I come now to the description MS
131: 19 “Since the world MS after deleted, which, moreover, contains a hint as to the objective counterpart of space.
132: 37 fact that ideas of things are in us MS replaced ideas of things existing in us (fol. 207)
133: 3–2 what perfectly corresponds to what follows from the things. MS replaced those things which perfectly correspond to those which follow from things.
133: 6 might seem to be MS replaced is
133: 7 and to amount MS replaced it amounts
133: 10 at the end of Chapter X, MS above deleted before after deleted above
133: 12 synthesis or MS inserted
133: 15 We must also suppose that clear perceptions differ from those that are confused by greater resemblance to their objects. MS inserted (see sec. 111 for its deletion)
133: 17 was MS above deleted I
133: 38 an individual MS inserted (fol. 208)
134: 26 that MS replaced of that the (fol. 209)
134: 28–35: 1 One of these … objects of sense. MS inserted (fol. 210)
134: 34 when this is admitted MS above deleted therefore
135: 12 that MS inserted
135: 14 employing MS above deleted using
135: 28 in question MS after deleted questionable (fol. 211)
135: 29 logical MS inserted
135: 30 set forth in Chapters II.–IV. above, MS above deleted, with which I began these lectures,
135: 32 each must MS replaced they must each
136: 17 present external things MS after deleted truth (fol. 212)
136: 19–20 conception MS after deleted pre-
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136: 20–1 loved to call himself MS] replaced called himself
136: 22 is MS] above deleted was
136: 26 clocks, MS] before deleted and others
136: 27–8 and even in Des Cartes’ MS] inserted as fol. 213
136n.: to require MS] above deleted
136: 28 Spinoza MS] after deleted Geulinx and (fol. 212)
136: 34 not MS] inserted
137: 1 there MS] inserted
137: 5 all MS] inserted
137: 15 long as MS] after deleted the (fol. 214)
137: 21–31 It is interesting … pre-established harmony. MS] inserted as fol. 215
137: 21 It is interesting to MS] inserted below deleted instruction: [Footnote]
137: 30 may MS] after deleted might
137: 32 this more allied hypothesis. MS] replaced these more allied hypotheses. (fol. 214)
138: 5 represents MS] above deleted perceives
138: 9–10 others (Met. § 66). MS] replaced others, like a clock that gains or loses (Met. § 66). (fol. 216)
138: 19 number of events MS] above deleted quantity of change
138: 30 the next chapter. MS] replaced my next lecture.
138n.: MS] inserted

Chapter XII

139: top left corner: word-count calculation of 34 X 220 for a result of 7480 with separate figure of 68,000 (fol. 217)
139: 1 Chapter MS] written over Lecture
139: 26 §1. The problem MS] below deleted Lecture XII. | Soul and Body. (fol. 218)
140: 4 Occasionalism MS] after deleted the
140n.: MS] inserted
140: 26 another MS] replaced the other (fol. 219)
140: 26 set it forth MS] after deleted explanation
140: 35 the body MS] above deleted it
141: 7–8 distinguished from the first class by memory, feeling, and attention MS] replaced not clearly distinguished from the first class, unless by memory, and a greater distinctness of perceptions
141: 9 Animals have souls, MS] before deleted and possibly even plants
141: 11 from him MS] inserted
141: 12–13 self-consciousness or apperception, by MS] inserted
141: 14 what is called reason. MS] what is called the possession of reason.
141: 17–18 [D. 231. Contrast G. VI 169] MS] inserted (see sec. 111)
141: 18–21 Spirits … knowing it. MS] inserted
141n.1: MS] inserted (fol. 220)
141n.2: MS] inserted
142: 6 the other MS] replaced another
142: 12 while MS] inserted
142: 14–27 “The activity … step to pain.” MS] inserted as fol. 221
142: 16–17 G. V. 195 MS] inserted
142: 18 whatever MS] above deleted only what is active
142: 28 Spinoza’ MS] after deleted Des Cartes and (fol. 220)
142n.: MS] inserted
142: 33 He MS] after deleted Leibniz (fol. 222)
142: 33 , moreover, MS] inserted
142: 34 cases of MS] inserted
143: 10 But MS] inserted
143: 18 the phrase “containing MS] replaced to “contain” (fol. 223)
143: 19–20 in relation both to MS] replaced both in relation to
143: 18 is that whose MS] after deleted Materia prima, here, (fol. 224; also at 146: 13–14, 32 (fol. 226))
144: 23 monads MS] after deleted be 144: 29 Arnauld, MS] above deleted a physicist (De Volder), 145: 2 that belongs to substance MS] re- placed corresponds in the substance 145: 9 monad, and it adheres MS] re- placed monad. It a 145n.1: cf. also D. 120. MS] inserted 145: 7–8 other substances if these all MS] replaced (all in pencil) substances if these (fol. 225) 145: 23 in their relation to God MS] after deleted to him 146: 24 must be MS] above deleted is 146: 34 number MS] above deleted series 146: 30 the finite MS] after deleted thus the finite
146: 11 confusedly; MS] distinctly; 146: 30 the finite MS] after deleted thus the finite
149: 33 proceed MS] after deleted set
150: 2 necessary MS] after deleted essential
150n.: MS] inserted 150: 22 “principles of life belong only to organic body (D. 163)” MS] inserted (see sec. 111)
150: 28 Leibniz says, MS] inserted (fol. 232) 151: 3 theory MS] above deleted doctrine 151: 12–13 an admission he had already made to Tournemine MS] inserted 151n.: (Erdmann p. 453. Hist. pp. XL, 98) (G. VI. 595), MS] inserted (a differ- ent note is at PL, p. 151; MS note was typeset in page proofs with serious (and er- roneous) alterations and does not appear in book; see sec. 111, 151: 13.)
151: 18 something MS] after deleted anything
151: 35–152: 9 The vinculum substantiale … soul (G. II. 481). MS] inserted as fol. 228 152: 6–7 afterwards led PL] afterwards compelled, MS] replaced compelled, later,
152: 18 first theory of body MS] theory of body which I gave in my last lecture (fol. 233)
152: 30 And when Arnauld MS] after de- leted Again (fol. 233)
153: 3 without such MS] after deleted the
153: 15–16 in so far as it is real, is many. MS] is many in so far as it is real. (its after
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Chapter XIII

155: 1 MS [no “Lecture” to be deleted, yet roman chapter no. in left corner]
155n.: MS inserted [fol. 238]
155: 6 underlying MS after deleted at the
155: 16 ¶The point of view MS j sign inserted
155: 21 he MS above deleted Leibniz
155: 23 This is also MS above deleted The same is
155: 6 us MS written over (fol. 239)
155: 16 in it we are PL in it we are MS replaced it is
155: 22 the things MS the inserted
155: 30 , he says, MS inserted
155: 3 the perceptible MS above deleted
156: 6 us MS written over (fol. 240)
155: 5 finite MS inserted
156: 7 apparently MS inserted
156: 8–9 perception MS replaced perceptions (4 times)
156: 15 a perception MS replaced the perception
156: 18 may be MS above deleted is
156: 20 very like MS after deleted which is
156: 21 denied by Locke and asserted
156: 22 is worth MS in pencil above deleted seems
156: 25 such that MS after deleted one
156: 26–7 is confused, MS inserted
156: 27 the marks MS all the marks (all inserted and deleted in pencil)
156: 30 conscious MS after deleted able to (fol. 241)
156: 31 (e.g. N. E. p. 120) MS inserted
156: 8 minute perceptions PL minute perception MS replaced a minute perception
157: 6 sufficiently MS inserted
158: 3 sufficiently MS inserted
158: 6 every MS above deleted the
158: 10 , in reply, MS inserted
158: 18 confesses, MS above deleted says,
158: 15–18 The senses, he says, give the material for reflection; we should not think of thought, if we did not think of something else, i.e. of the particular things which the senses furnish (p. 220). MS inserted
158: 24–7 Leibniz explains that when he says (he says inserted) truths are innate, he does not mean simply that the mind has the faculty of knowing them, but that it has the faculty of finding them in itself (N. E. 74–5). It cannot be denied, however, that both in the remainder of this passage, and elsewhere, he falls back into the explanation of truths as psychical dispositions. (e.g. N. E. 84, 105). MS inserted [fol. 242]
158: 27 the MS inserted
158: 33 Leibniz. MS Leibniz. before deleted ¶In my next Lecture I shall examine further Leibniz’s theory of knowledge, which depends throughout upon confused and unconscious perception.
159: 2 a MS inserted [fol. 243]
159: 16 minute and unconscious MS after deleted confused and u
159: 17 create a difficulty in the MS above deleted have no
159: 23 true MS inserted
159: 27 Chapter MS (no lecture to be replaced)

Chapter XIV

160: 1 Chapter PL Lecture MS [fol. 244]
160: 6–7 of Chapters II.–IV. PL with which I began my lectures MS
160: 7 in MS after deleted of
160: 11 or, MS inserted
160: 12 problem MS above deleted question
160: 13 origin MS above deleted natural history
160: 15–16, and, as Leibniz truly says, is not preliminary in philosophy (D. 95).
18 have supposed MS] replaced supposed
16: 21 might seem MS] above deleted also appears
16: 23–161: 6 At the same time ... of be-
lief. MS] inserted as fol. 245
16: 24 Locke is in one sense justified. The MS] replaced the
16: 1 or MS] above deleted of
16: 20 explains MS] above deleted hints
(fol. 244; fol. 246)
16: 21 70 MS] inserted
16: 35 quite definite, MS] inserted
16: 35–162: 9 The nearest approach ... beliefs. MS] inserted as fol. 247
16: 6 explained MS] after deleted which I
16: 9 He MS] replaced but he (fol. 246)
16: 16 they are MS] inserted
16: 16 the external MS] after deleted ex-
ternality
16: 23 (cf. G. II. 265) MS] inserted
16: 27 indeed MS] in pencil above deleted in fact (fol. 248)
16: 32 intellect MS] above deleted mind
16: 34–163: 1 “It is very true ... [G. V. 23 (N. E. 24) PL] “It is very true ...
[N. E. 24] MS] inserted as fol. 249
16: 3–1 is innate to itself, and therefore contains certain ideas essentially (G. III. 479 N. E. p. 100). MS] inserted with N. E. p. 100 inserted within
16: 12 cannot MS] above deleted could not
16: 12 a causal MS] inserted
16: 12 is MS] above deleted was
16: 18–166: 10 This. The doctrine ... ap-
titudes” [N. E. 105; G. V. 97]. MS] inserted as fos. 250–252
16: 20 while MS] inserted (fol. 250)
16: 22 theory MS] above deleted doctrine
16: 22 which are known MS] inserted
16: 24 theory MS] above deleted doctrine
16: 35 it is held, MS] inserted
16: 9 innate knowledge is only virtual (p. 76), while all MS] inserted after deleted
16: 10 knowledge MS] before deleted of such truths
16: 29 this is equally present MS] re-
placed we know (fol. 254)
16: 8 particular MS] inserted
16: 12 ideas MS] after deleted these
16: 18. MS] inserted on fol. 252
16: 27 exist MS] before deleted out (?)
16: 28 merely MS] inserted
16: 6 merely something MS] inserted
16: 11 in Leibniz, MS] inserted above de-
leted then (fol. 248)
16: 20 distinctly MS] after deleted already (fol. 253)
16: 20 he MS] above deleted Leibniz
16: 20 He MS] in pencil above deleted Leibniz
16: 29 ultimate MS] inserted
16: 31–4 Nothing, he says, should be taken as primitive principles, except ex-
periences and the law of identity, with-
out which last there would be no differ-
ence between truth and falsehood (D. p. 94). MS] inserted (see sec. 111)
16: 36 this is only the case, MS] inserted
16: 10 existence, MS] inserted (fol. 254)
16: 18 the existence of MS] inserted
16: 18 is as MS] replaced are
16: 27 G. IV. 422–6 MS] inserted
16: 30 and MS] above deleted of
16: 34 is also either symbolical or intuitive MS] replaced adequate knowledge is symbolical or intuitive or both
16: 35 adequate MS] symbolical
16: 37 me MS] in pencil us (fol. 255)
16: 25 our MS] in pencil above deleted or
16: 29 104. This MS] after inserted ¶ (fol. 236)
16: 30 A real definition, as opposed to one which is merely nominal, shows MS] replaced For a real definition shows (For a edited in pencil)
16: 38 important MS] above deleted good
16: 38–169: 6 A definition ... predicated
[N. E. p. 325] MS] inserted (see sec. 117)
16: 99 when we say MS] inserted
16: 16 human MS] replaced in pencil a man (twice)
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169: 17 in doubt MS] after deleted unable
169: 21 more MS] inserted
169: 22 bald MS] before deleted (p. 328)
169: 22 thinks MS] seems to think
170: 7 à priori MS] inserted (fol. 258 (fol. 257 being out of order—see 186: 26 below))
170: 14 The MS] after deleted Theo
170: 18 akin to MS] above deleted
170: 22 bald MS] before deleted
171: 8 a MS] in pencil after deleted
172: 1 Chapter MS] in pencil above deleted
172: 3, 4 part MS] written over point
172: 17 , Goodness and Wisdom. MS] replaced in pencil and Goodness and wisdom.
172: 20 the four. MS] replaced four.
173n.2: MS] inserted
173: 15 Being MS] written over being (fol. 262)
173: 35 The contents MS] after deleted in pencil This paper has been supposed (e.g. by Stein) to show that Leibniz was, at that time, specially influenced by Spinoza. For my part, I can see absolutely no grounds for such an inference. (fol. 262)
173: 35–6 , in spite of its early date, MS] inserted in pencil
174: 14–15 A and B are not incompatible, MS] inserted
174: 18 not self-contradictory; MS] after deleted poss
174: 28 in the subject MS] below inserted and deleted not (fol. 263)
174: 30 would have MS] inserted
175: 11 superior MS] inserted (fol. 264)
175: 32 synthetic MS] after deleted idea of
175: 34 actual MS] possible
175n.: MS] inserted
175: 11 superior MS] inserted (fol. 264)
175: 32 such grounds, however, PL] but such grounds, MS] replaced and such grounds,
175: 34–5 and this Leibniz virtually admits by calling this proof an argument
176: 22 an existent MS] above deleted the existing (fol. 265)
176: 27 contingent MS] underlined in pencil
176: 31 the world MS] after deleted his (fol. 266)
176: 32 from it necessarily. MS] transposed in pencil from necessarily from it.
176: 39 274 MS] inserted
177: 4 good MS] after deleted right
177: 3 (G. IV. 438) MS] inserted
177: 19–178: 8 MS] leaf has no alterations (fol. 267; at this point fol. 268 is out of order—see 187: 25–36)
178: 13–31 Thus confused ideas … but also God. MS] inserted on fol. 269 from fol. 270
178: 15–16 God’s understanding is MS] replaced God is (fol. 270)
178: 15 region MS] above deleted locus
178: 21 God] God alone, MS] replaced God
178n.: PL] Monadology in pencil above deleted Mon. MS] inserted
178: 26 , after all, MS] inserted in pencil
179: 13 eternal MS] inserted
179: 20 possible MS] inserted (fol. 271)
179: 28 what he knows MS] after deleted this is
179: 33 Goodness MS] after deleted Wisdo
179n.: MS] parenthetical reference in text converted to footnote by pencil asterisks
180: 4 to MS] inserted
180: 6 Again, MS] after deleted Finally,
180: 6 identity or MS] inserted
180: 12 consider MS] after deleted in pencil I invite you
180: 18 (D. 225), MS] inserted
180: 21 we MS] in pencil above deleted you
180: 28 studying MS] inserted (fol. 272)
180n.: MS] inserted from fol. 274
181: 1 a MS] inserted (fol. 273)
181: 15 as to MS] inserted (fol. 274)
181: 23 273. We have now seen MS] inserted in pencil below deleted in pencil
181: 25 Lecture XVI. | The Place of God in Leibniz’s Philosophy. and after deleted I ended my last lecture by pointing out (fol. 275)
220  BLACKWELL AND Griffin

181: 24–5 reinforce the above arguments MS] in pencil above deleted begin this lecture
181: 32 exalted MS] above deleted raised
181: 34 , on this view, MS] inserted
182: 13 collapses MS] after deleted falls (fol. 276)
182: 20 rests on MS] above deleted springs from
182: 26 nothing, or even meaningless. MS] replaced
182: 27 , on this theory, MS] inserted in pencil
182: 28 (perhaps) MS] inserted
183: 9 , or some one else, MS] inserted (fol. 277)
183: 30 [e.g. G. IV. 486 (D. 79; L. 316)] PL] [e.g. L. 316; G. IV. 486] MS] inserted with e.g. inserted in insertion
183n.: MS] inserted and footnoted (fol. 279)
184: 25 necessary MS] above deleted eternal
184: 26 God’s volitions could not MS] replaced God not
184: 28 though MS] inserted
185: 15 necessary MS] after deleted owed (? (fol. 280)
185: 24 contain MS] above deleted have
185: 32 it MS] after deleted the argument
185: 34 it MS] above deleted the argument
186: 6 attribute MS] above deleted predicate (fol. 281)
186: 12 passage of the Discours de Métaphysique might almost have been written by Spinoza. PL] passages might almost have been written by Spinoza. “All realities and perfections emanate from God by a kind of continual creation.” MS] passage made plural and last sentence inserted
186: 26–187: 8 Leibniz once approaches ... (My italics). MS] inserted on fol. 281 from fol. 257 (out of order in file); at top: [V. Guhrauer, Leibnitzens Deutsche Schriften, I, 411]
187: 25 slips. MS] before deleted, the more so as the custom (fol. 282)
187: 25–36 The usual expressions ... the fact that MS] inserted on fol. 282 from fol. 268 (out of order in file)
187: 25 usual MS] after deleted pl
187: 32 the primitive one MS] replaced primitive
187: 35 if only because MS] after deleted from the fact that
188: 1 have MS] inserted (fol. 282)
188: 2 subsequent MS] future
188: 4 supposition. MS] after deleted remark.
188: 24 the truth of MS] inserted
188: 26–7 quite arbitrary what propositions God is to believe. PL] strictly meaningless to assert that God has any knowledge of the truth MS] of the truth inserted in pencil (fol. 283)
188: 34 and must MS] after deleted but
189: 5 its MS] inserted
189: 25 or MS] after deleted and (fol. 284)
189n.: MS] inserted with , where moral perfection appears as a species of metaphysical perfection in pencil
190: 7 Ethics MS] after deleted do
190: 7–8 this work MS] in pencil above deleted these lectures

Chapter XVI

191: 1 Chapter XVI. MS] Lecture XVII. ] II appears written over to become I in XVI (fol. 283)
191: 5 indeed MS] inserted
191: 12 his MS] inserted
191: 14–15 Though I shall treat the subject briefly, MS] replaced I shall have to treat the subject briefly, as only one lecture remains for it. But
191: 26 term. MS] before deleted There are three [three written over two] principle (sic) meanings which Leibniz attaches to the word. One is self-determination or spontaneity, the second (second
I. Alterations within the Main Manuscript

above deleted other) is freedom from the slavery to passion, the third is the fact that the will is always contingent, not necessary [N. E. p. 179].

192: 2 , opposed to necessity, MS] inserted (fol. 286)
192: 16 distinct MS] after deleted free
192n.1: MS] originally in text
192n.2: MS] inserted
192n.3: MS] originally in text
192: 36 follow MS] inserted (fol. 287)
193: 16 no MS] written over in pencil
193: 17 have spontaneity MS] after deleted are spontane
193: 23 , accordingly, MS] inserted
193n.2: MS] inserted (fol. 288–289)
193: 30 contingency MS] after deleted liberty
193: 38–9 (Cf. Pollock’s … distinctions.) MS] inserted
193: 39–41 [Cf. Pollock’s Spinoza, p. 208. Spinoza has only the opposition free or constrained, not Leibniz’s further distinctions] MS] inserted
194: 6 the determined is opposed to it.) PL] what is opposed to this is determined.) MS
194: 8 if MS] above deleted in case
194: 30 that MS] inserted
194: 44 harmful MS] after deleted liberty
195n.1: MS] inserted
195n.1: “By pleasure I shall, therefore, hereafter, understand an affection whereby the mind passes to a greater perfection; and by pain an affection whereby it passes to a less perfection.” (inserted from fol. 291)
195n.1: ib. Prop. LIX. Schol. MS] inserted before deleted and Hobbes
195: 11 innate instincts MS] after deleted no innate practical principles, but there are (fol. 290)
195n.3: MS] inserted
195n.3: “We have not endeavour, will, appetite or desire for anything because we deem it good, but contrariwise deem a thing good because we have an endeavour, will, appetite, or desire for it.” MS] replaced “We neither strive for, wish, seek, nor desire anything, because we think it to be good, but on the contrary, we adjudge a thing to be good because we strive for, wish, seek, or desire it.” (fol. 291)
195n.3: Part III MS] replaced Bk. III
195: 14 pursue MS] after deleted follow
195: 20 seek MS] after deleted seek (fol. 290)
195: 28–9 reason only useful in showing MS] replaced that reason only shows
196: 2 must be MS] above deleted is
196: 5 necessarily MS] inserted (fol. 292)
196: 6 the good MS] after deleted desire
196: 10 supposing that the good means the desired. MS] replaced psychological hedonism, i.e. does not suppose that the good means the desired.
196: 14 God’s will MS] replaced the god’s will
196: 26–9 And similarly vice is not the force of action, but an impediment to it, such as ignorance (G. II. 317). In fact, original sin and materia prima are almost indistinguishable. MS] inserted with PL replacing like with such as
196: 32 what he does say is that MS] replaced he says
196: 34 that MS] inserted in pencil
197: 1 (G. IV. 454) MS] inserted
197: 3 indicates MS] after deleted presents
197: 19 , and harmonizes MS] replaced ; it (fol. 293)
197: 25 fundamental MS] after deleted ethically
198: 19–20 And hence Leibniz rejects Des Cartes’ principle, that errors depend more on the will than on the intellect
II. EXCHANGES IN MOORE’S PAGE PROOFS
OF "THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNIZ"

Moore commented to Russell about the page proofs: “As to the proofs, many of the pencil marks were made for my own benefit alone; accordingly I have put a little cross of ink ["X"] in sec. 111 where I saw reason to suggest an actual correction. I have been through all the Latin passages” (c. May 1900; O'Briant, p. 182). Moore and Russell exchanged comments at four places in the page proofs. The underlinings are Moore’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>PL Proofs</th>
<th>Moore’s Comment</th>
<th>Russell’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149: 2–5</td>
<td>Thus the body consists merely of those inferior monads whose points of view, at any given time, are so near that of the dominant monad that they perceive everything less clearly than it does.</td>
<td>It is not because they are near that they perceive less clearly.</td>
<td>[Yes: nearness is essential, otherwise things in their neighbourhood but remote from the dominant monad would be perceived more clearly by them.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163: 39–164: 2</td>
<td>It (an argument for the innateness of knowledge) seems to depend upon the radically vicious disjunction that knowledge must be either caused by what is known or wholly uncaused.</td>
<td>Does this represent the doctrine of innateness?</td>
<td>(Yes: since the knowledge is always in the mind, and not only at certain times.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Exchanges in Moore’s Page Proofs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187:</td>
<td>In the two passages where God is called a monad, this does not occur very directly…. The other is more direct. “The monad or simple substance contains in its generic definition (PP: the genus perception) and appetition, and is either the primitive one or God, in which is the ultimate reason of things, or is derivative, i.e. a created monad” (G. VII. 502).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Surely G. VII. 502 quoted p. 150 is another case; ‘created monad’ being opposite to God in its generic definition. [G. VII. 502 is the page of one of the passages quoted: the quotation on p. 150 is hardly a new passage]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287:</td>
<td>(PP:) Or, if it is not necessary that A and B should be in the same subject, they cannot therefore be in the same subjects…. (PL: In other words, since it is not necessary that A and B should not be in the same subject, they can therefore be in the same subject;)…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–7</td>
<td>Surely this makes nonsense. I think the ‘non’ before possunt should be transposed to before sint; giving translation as above. [I agree with you; the passage had puzzled me much.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. SUBSTANTIVE REVISIONS BETWEEN MANUSCRIPT, PAGE PROOFS AND FIRST EDITION OF “THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNIZ”

Preface
[first edition pages are in brackets]
xi[v]: 8 growth PL replaced on PP development MS, PP
xiii[vii]: 4 excellent PL admirable MS, PP
xiv[viii]: 2 laid PP, PL laid MS
xv[ix]: 14 September 1900 PL August 1900 MS, PP

Chapter I
1n.: (G. VI. 483) PL not present MS, PP
2: 6 discovered PL found MS, PP
3: 38–9 proof that his system PL fact that it MS, PP
4: 2 the permanent PL perception that it so follows is the permanent MS, PP
6: 1 then PL still with then inserted in

Moore’s hand on PP] then still MS
6: 19 correspondence PP, PL correspondence MS
6: 21 during PL thus during MS, PP
6n.1: PL not present MS, PP
6n.4.: Chapter IV PL not present MS, PP
7: 4 only slight traces remain PL very little trace remains MS, PP
7n.: PL not present MS, PP

Chapter II
8: 6 seems to be PP, PL not present MS
12n.: PL not present MS, PP
13: 4 is the subject PL not present MS, PP
13: 5 or ratio PL not present MS, PP
14n.1: PL not present MS, PP
15n.2: PP, PL not present MS
15: 30 belief (2nd occurrence) PL
agnosticism—his limitation of categories to experience, and his belief MS,
PP (with Agnosticism)
15: 31 was largely PL largely inserted in Moore’s hand on PP—was MS
17: 21 as we have just seen, PP, PL not present MS
18: 11 all PL replaced on PP one and all MS
18: 14 to the first type PP, PL not present MS
18: 17–18 N. E. p. 516; G. V. 429 PL replaced on PP] Ib. MS
18n.: Foucher de Careil … 1854, PL not present MS, PP
18n.: (D. 175); G. V. 268 (N. E. 309); G. II. 49. PP, PL] N. E. p. 309, D. 175;
G. V. 268; II. 49. MS
19: 12 223 PL inserted on PP] 222–3 MS
19: 22 424 PL inserted on PP] 425 MS
19: 26 ideas in general PL replaced on PP] all ideas MS
19n.: We shall find, when we PL replaced on PP] I shall show, when I MS
20: 6 or collections of predicates, PP, PL not present MS
20n.: PP, PL not present MS
20n.: quoted by PL] inserted on PP] not present MS
21: 15–16 relations—relations which can only be expressed in synthetic
propositions PP, PL] relations, which always involve synthetic relations MS
22: 4 that, PP, PL not present MS
22: 37 analysis PP, PL] the analysis MS
24: 24 the analytic PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] the synthetic MS

Chapter III
25: 18 held to be PL] replaced on PP] invoked as MS
26: 5 in fact PL] replaced on PP] in effect MS
26: 7 who distinguish PL] replaced on PP] distinguishing MS
26: 18 are PP, PL] is MS
26: 24 , or PP, PL] and MS
27: 27 has PL] replaced on PP] had MS
27: 38 has PP, PL] marked with “?X” in Moore’s hand on PP] MS
28: 8 do so necessarily PL] replaced on PP] necessarily do so MS
28: 10 journey PP, PL] voyage MS
28: 25–6 And hence Leibniz often speaks of them as contingent predicates. PP,
PL] not present MS
28: 29 little PP, PL] no MS
28n.: PP, PL] not present MS
29: 32 essential to PP, PL] the essence of MS
29: 33 by means PP, PL] , as we shall see, MS
30: 11 or PL] replaced on PP] or MS
30: 13–14 follow necessarily from any other existential proposition, nor yet
PP, PL] follow MS
30: 30–1 causality, asserting all possible causes to be desires or appetites PL]
causality, MS, PP (with Moore’s “X”) MS
30: 32–3 determined by desire for the good PL] final MS, PP (Moore’s “X”)
30n.: PP, PL] not present MS
31: 6 earlier PP, PL] earliest MS
31: 7 especially PP, PL] not present MS
31: 13 statement PP, PL] enunciation MS
31: 13 veritable, PL] true; MS
31: 15 kinds PP, PL] sorts MS
31: 16 Truths PP, PL] The truths MS
31: 17 ; truths PP, PL] , and those MS
31: 20 there must also be a sufficient reason for PP, PL] the sufficient reason
must also be found in MS
31: 21 fact PP, PL] facts MS
31: 21 for PP, PL] in MS
31: 21–2 which are dispersed PP, PL] spread MS
31: 22 created beings, in which PP, PL] creatures, where MS
31: 23 might go on PP, PL] can go MS
31: 23 endless PP, PL] an unlimited MS
31: 24 (D. 222–3; L. 235–7; G. VI. 612) PP, PL] (D. 222–3) MS
31: 27 “Thus far PP, PL] “Up to this time MS
31: 27 only as mere PP, PL] as simple MS
31: 28 rise PP, PL] advance MS
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

31: 29 affirms PP, PL] teaches MS
32: 29 one PP, PL] him MS
31: 31–2 know things sufficiently PP, PL] sufficiently understand things MS
31: 31 things are PP, PL] it is MS
31: 32 being PP, PL] not present MS
31: 34 we are entitled to put will PP, PL] which should rightly be asked would MS
31: 35 is there PL] replaced there is MS
31: 36 nothing PP, PL] nothing MS
32: 2 thus PL] so MS
32: 15 (L. 338; D. 100; G. VII. 302) PP, PL] (L. 339; D. 100) MS
33: 8 ¶There PP, PL] There MS
33: 11 to speak so, the principle cannot have been new even in 1676. But the connection with final causes, which later became more and more important, does not appear in this passage. Cf. Spinoza, *Ethics*, I, 11, 2nd dem. PP] not present MS
34: 12–13 applied to actual existents MS, PP, PL] (Moore’s “X”; it would seem also, as applied to possibles)
34: 14–15 causes, in the sense that actual desires are always directed towards what appears to be best. PL] causes.
35: 1 (D. 103; L. 342–3; G.VII. 304) PP, PL] (D. 103) MS
35: 3 determined by desire for what appears best, PL] final, MS, PP
35: 8 as well PP, PL] also MS
35: 11 will PP, PL] , on the other hand, will MS
35: 13 enquire PL] inquire MS, PP
35n.: amount PL] magnitude MS, PP
35n.: (Monadology, § 41, D. 224) PL] (D. 224) MS, PP
35n.: In the sentence … perfection. See Chap. XVI. PL] not present MS
35n.: he speaks of “imperfection or PL] replaced Leibniz speaks of “imperfection as with Moore’s “X” being on PP
36: 6 (G. II. 51; § 13) PL] (G. II. 51) MS, PP
36: 10 ends of God PL] ends MS, PP
36: 21 preceding PL] last MS, PP
36: 28–9 This form of causality PP, PL] This MS
36n.: II PL] replaced XI on PP] II MS
36n.: “I retort,” PL] I retort, MS, PP
36n.: Leibniz replies, “to PL] replaced with ” Leibniz says, “ PP] to MS
36n.: conception PP, PL] concept MS
36n.: a possible cause, to conceive … cause.” PP, PL] an actual cause.” MS
37: 4 for its creation PP, PL] not present MS
37: 8–10 So Leibniz says … (G. IV. 438)'.
PP, PL] not present MS
37: 16 his MS, PL] His PP
37n.1: [G. VII.] PL] inserted on PP
37n.2: PL] not present MS
37: 28–38: 1 produce their effects necessarily. PL] replaced on PP] necessarily produce their effects. MS
38: 11 anything except God PL] replaced on PP] anything MS
38: 29 any other PP, PL] any MS
39: 3 and 39n.: necessary'. PL] necessary. (textual location of note on fol. 73 not specified; note omitted in PP) MS
39: 7 into Spinozism. MS, PP, PL] queried in Moore’s hand on PP
39n.: MS, PL] not present PP
39n.: necessary, but this conclusion PL] necessary. But in this MS
39n.: referring solely PL] referring MS
39n.: world. PL] world of creatures MS
39n.: make this supposition PL] suppose this MS
39n.: further, since we should then PL] further back and MS
39n.: necessary, God’s goodness would also be necessary PL] itself necessary, it would seem to make God necessarily good MS
39n.: itself require a sufficient PL] require a new MS

Chapter IV
40: 3 chapter PP, PL] lecture MS (also at 78: 8, 124: 26, 161: 7, 162: 6, 191: 3; see also 199: 26)
40: 9 6 PP, PL] is MS
40: 20 133). The PL] 132], and that the MS, PP
40: 21 it, he says, PL] it MS, PP
40: 22 : from PL] . For replaced as . From its Moore’s hand on PP] . From MS
40: 22 substance PL] substance, he says, MS, PP
41: 10 VI PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] VI MS
41: 36 (1) that PL] that (1) MS, PP
41n.: PL] not present MS, PP
42: 2 But he avoids, PL] He avoids, however, MS, PP
42: 9 (cf. G. II. 221) PL] not present MS, PP
42: 14 support or substratum PP, PL] support or substratum MS
42: 34 are PP, PL] Moore queried and suggested must be on PP] MS
43: 4 individual PL] Moore’s “X” marked misprint: individual PP] individual MS
43: 17 Substance PL] A substance replaced on PP] Substance MS
43: 34 my PP, PL] the MS
44: 7 169 PL] 147 MS, PP
44: 28 (L. 300, n.; PP, PL] (L. 300, MS
44n.1: philosophers PL] older philosophers MS, PP
45: 2 capacity PP, PL] power MS (also at 45: 5)
45: 6 entelechy PL] Moore’s “X” marked misprint antielechy PP] entelechy MS
46: 3 Lotze PP, PL] Lotze and Mr. Bradley MS
46n.1: PL] not present MS, PP
46n.2: PP, PL] not present MS
46: 20 related necessarily PL] necessarily related MS, PP
46: 31–2 either as true or as false PP, PL] as either true or false MS
47: 17 connection PL] Moore’s “X” marked apparent misprint in this word on PP] connection MS
47: 37–8 or of continuous simple transition, PL] Moore’s “X” with Latin for this insertion on PP] not present MS
48: 1–2 That there should be a persistent law, involving the future states of that which we conceive as the same, PL] Moore wrote the final reading on PP above deleted That a certain law, involving its future states, persists in a substance, MS, PP
48: 5 phrase PP, PL] ordinary phrase MS
48: 6 its nature PL] itself MS, PP
48n.: PP, PL] not present MS
49: 11 substances PL] substance MS, PP
49n.1: single PL] single replaced particular
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

at both occurrences, 2nd being suggested in Moore’s hand on PP] particular MS
49n.2: PL] not present MS, PP
50: 12 wholly destitute of meaning MS, PP, PL] Moore commented: “It has a meaning but we don’t know which?” on PP
50: 26 temporal predicates PL] predicates MS, PP
51: 9 eternally MS, PL] Moore’s “X” with comment: “It can unless ‘eternal’ means ‘throughout time’.” on PP
51: 28 for Leibniz PL] not present MS, PP
52: 11 there are substances. PP, PL] substances. MS
52: 28 all past states, and is big with all future states. It is further a reflection PP, PL] all past and future states, and is a reflection MS

Chapter V (unlike other chapters, which have one running head, Chapter V employs three different ones)
54: 12 and that PL] that inserted in Moore’s hand after his “X” on PP] that MS
54: 20 not in nature two PL] in nature not two PP] two MS
55: 12 also used PP, PL] used also MS
55: 24 once at least PL] sometimes MS, PP
55: 26 at other times PL] sometimes MS, PP
56: 10 rather than PP, PL] rather than to have MS
57: 1 , on Leibniz’s theory, place PL] place, on Leibniz’s theory, MS, PP
60: 18 many PP, PL] many MS
60: 20 must be diversity PP, PL] must (be) of the diversity MS
60: 20 one PP, PL] one MS
61: 19 so PL] Moore’s “X”; his so replaced as on PP] so MS
61: 20 accomplish.” MS, PL] Moore’s “X”; he added closing quotes on PP] accomplish PP
61: 21 Leibniz PP, PL] he MS
61n.: PL] in text MS, PP
62: 8 truths about possible MS, PP, PL] Moore noted “?X” by the line on PP
64n.: PL] not present MS, PP
65: 10 we shall find PL] replaced evidently queried by Moore on PP] evidently MS
65: 18–19 (L. 380; N. E. 52; G. V. 51) PP, PL] (N. E. 52; G. V. 51) MS
65n.1: PP, PL] not present MS
65n.1: exist PL] are PP
65n.1: God, who knows distinctly their essential gradations, PL] God PP
65n.1: [Guhrauer, Leibnitz: Eine Biographie, Anmerkungen zum zweiten Buche, p. 32.] PL] not present MS, PP
66: 30–1 i.e. … i.e. PL] “itals” in Moore’s hand on PP] i.e. … i.e. MS
67: 11 (cf. supra, pp. 19, 20) PL] inserted on PP, Moore having commented on the sentence, “The inference is not sufficiently obvious”] not present MS
67: 19 ends of God PL] inserted on PP] ends MS
67: 22 motion MS, PL] notion PP
67: 23 motions MS, PL] notions PP
67n.: § 67.) PL] § 67.) The above passage seems to have escaped Lotze’s attention. MS
68: 23–4 any one PP] precisely similar to deleted with query in Moore’s hand on PP] precisely similar to any one MS
68: 32–3 (though not Causality itself) except causality itself MS
68n.: PL] inserted on PP] not present MS
69: 15 good The PL] good. The MS, PP (period lacking in 1st edition and reprints)

Chapter VI
70: 16 Gassendi and Hobbes PP, PL] Gassendi MS
70: 17–18 L. 300 and D. 72 PP, PL] L. 300 MS
71: 15 in the Système Nouveau: PL] in the inserted in Moore’s hand on PP] (“Système Nouveau” taken from MS footnote)
the principles of a real unity

the continuum

the principles of a real unity

the continuum

71: 20–1 the principles of a real unity PL] the principles of a real unity MS, PP

71: 26–7 the continuum PL] the continuum MS, PP


72: 10 the whole of PL] inserted on PP] this entire MS

72: 24 might happen PP, PL] are possible MS

72: 25 ca. PL] inserted on PP] not present MS

72: 34 suitable PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] sufficient MS

73: 13 …regards all the aspects of the world PL] replaced on PP] perceives the universe MS

73: 14 in all possible ways PL] replaced on PP] from each point of view MS

73: 15 seen from PL] seen inserted on PP] from MS

73: 16 sees fit to make PL] replaced on PP] makes MS

73: 17 produce PL] replaced on PP] produces MS

73: 18 but it PL] but inserted on PP] it MS

73: 27 only PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] so much MS

73: 27–8 but also PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] [i.e. metaphysical necessity] as MS

73: 35 D. 102, 103; L. 340, 341 PL] replaced D. 101, 103; L. 340, 343 on PP] D. 101, 103; MS

73n.: PL] inserted on PP] not present MS

74n.: D. 86; PP, PL] not present MS

74n.: neither PL] replaced never on PP] not present MS

Chapter VII

75: 10 (cf. G. IV. 106) PL] inserted on PP] not present MS

75: 235 PL] replaced on PP] not present MS

76: 34 dominates PL] replaced nominates in Moore’s hand on PP] dominates MS

77: 25 the Marquise du Chatelet, PP, PL] his “divine Emily”, the Marquise du Chatelet, MS

77n.2: This results e.g. PL] replaced on PP] at (sic) least this would seem to result MS


77n.2: appears also PL] replaced as also appears on PP] appears MS

77n.2: Again in PL] inserted on PP] In MS

77n.2: Entwickelungsgang PP, PL (misprint) Entwickelungsgang MS (fol. 129f)

78: 27 G. IV. 395; G. M. VI. 100 PP, PL] G. IV. 395 MS

78n.: Cf. G. IV. 106 (1669): “The definition of a body is that it exists in space.” Also Ib. 171 (1670). PL] inserted on PP] not present MS

78n.: Leibniz appears … Eucharist … p. 77. PL] He replaced Leibniz on PP] not present MS

79: 3 (ib.) PL] [N. E. 701; G. M. VI. 100] MS, PP

79: 5 force PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] power MS

79: 5–6 the active constitutes PP, PL] active MS

79: 6 Passive force is that very PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] Passive power is the MS

79: 11 materia prima PP, PL] primary matter MS (also at 79: 30, 103; 3, 103: 11, 103: 15, 103: 16–17, 144: 14, 145: 25) MS

79: 26 asserts PL] continues MS, PP

79n.: See L. 352–3; N. E. 678; PL] N. E. 678 inserted on PP] See L. 352–3; MS


80: 25 ; G. IV. 369 PP, PL] not present MS

80n.2: scarcely less PL] replaced on PP] no less MS

80n.2: , when repelled from PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] repelled by MS

80n.3: [G. III. 69] PL] added after Moore’s call for reference on PP] not present MS

81: 3 235 PL] replaced on PP] 234 MS

81: 21 ; G. VI. 540 PP, PL] not present MS
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

81: 36 Statics PL] capitalized with Moore’s query on PP] statics MS (also at 82: 2)
82: 3 (N. E. 675; G. M. VI. 239) PL] (G. M. VI. 238) MS, PP
82: 13 always PL] inserted on PP] not present MS
82: 16 equality PL] principle of the equality MS, PP
82: 16 analytical Calculus PL] analytic calculus MS, PP
82: 18–19 mechanical Algebra by the use of this axiom PL] Mechanical Algebra in Moore’s hand on PP] algebraic Mechanics MS
82n.1: , p. 10, and Foucher de Careil, Réfutation inédite de Spinoza, p. lxiv. PP, PL] p. 10 MS
82n.3: 211–5 PL] 212–5 MS, PP
83: 3 were PL] are MS, PP
83: 15 has an endeavour PP, PL] makes an effort MS
83: 17 ; G. IV. 511 PP, PL] not present MS
84: 4–5 argument in favour of force PL] argument MS, PP
84: 14 ; G. IV. 369 PP, PL] not present MS
84: 24 (Fb.) PP, PL] [D. 60, 61] MS
84n: See Newton, Principia, Scholium to the eighth definition. Contrast, in Clerk Maxwell’s Matter and Motion, Arts. XVIII, CV. PL] comma after Contrast inserted in Moore’s hand on PP] not present MS
85: 3–4 that the total … cause PL] italics and closing quotes inserted in Moore’s hand PP] no italics MS
85: 4 353 PL] 354 MS, PP
85: 15 than do PP, than MS
86: 4 ; G. VII. 304 PP, PL] not present MS
86: 17 not, PL] comma added in Moore’s hand PP] not MS
86: 25 its effect PL] effect MS, PP
86: 25 ; G. II. 137 PP, PL] not present MS
86: 36 shall PL] inserted in Moore’s hand on PP] not present MS
86: 38 ; G. IV. 369 PP, PL] not present MS
86: 39 ; G. VII. 404 PP, PL] not present MS
87: 6 ; G. VII. 401–2 PP, PL] not present MS
87: 30 235 PP, PL] 234 MS
88: 1–2 it be produced in the bodies PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] this force in bodies be produced from MS
88: 3 the PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] a MS
88: 6 constitute the very essence of PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] produce MS
88: 6 relevant that PP, PL] necessary because MS
88: 9 it never exists as a whole, since PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] a whole never exists, when it MS
88: 11 at all is real in it, except that momentary property PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] is so real in itself, as that momentary increment MS
88: 26–7 ; G. M. VI. 247 PL] replaced the 246 on PP] not present MS
88: 29 ; G. M. VI. 252 PL] replaced the 251 on PP] not present MS
88: 38 ; Archiv. I. 577 PP, PL] not present MS
88n.: PP, PL] not present MS
89: 29 fluid. PL] deletion of remainder of MS reading on PP] fluid—or rather, of all pervading fluids, for three were needed in his theory (Wundt op. cit. p. 30; Tentamen de motuum coelestium causis, G. M. VI.). MS
89: 35–6 ; G. M. VI. 230–231 PP, PL] not present MS
90: 8 ; G. M. VI. 228 PL] replaced the 229 on PP] not present MS
90: 11 suggests PP, PL] bases MS
91: 13–15 all matter consists of material points, and all action is action at a distance. These material points PP, PL] material points attract at ordinary distances, and repel at very small distances. They MS
91: 17–18 attraction or repulsion PP, PL]
attraction MS
91n.1: p. 224 ff. PP, PL] p.  MS
91n.3: Boscovich differs from Newtonian Dynamics chiefly in assuming that, at very small distances, the force between two particles is repulsive. He differs from the Newtonian philosophy by regarding action at a distance as ultimate. PP, PL] not present MS
92: 21–2 ; G. V. 140 PP, PL] not present MS
92: 26 ; G. VII. 356, 378 PP, PL] not present MS
92: 28 less theological PL] more mathematical MS, PP
〈 where Moore queried mathematical 〉
92: 32 ; VII. 378 PP, PL] not present MS
92: 26 ; G. VII. 356, 378 PP, PL] not present MS
92: 28 ; VII. 356, 378 PP, PL] not present MS
92: 35 ; G. VII. 372 PP, PL] not present MS
93: 14–15 A man will have an equal right to say that anything is PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] It can be said that anything is, by an equal title, MS
93: 15–16 or time PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] and time MS
93: 16–17 ; G. IV. 507 PP, PL] not present MS
93: 24 in Leibniz’s PL] replaced in Moore’s hand with a query PP] on Leibniz’s MS
93n.: L. 385; G. V. 52 PP, PL] not present MS
93n.: It should indeed be PP, PL] It is indeed MS
94: 17 ; G. IV. 512–3 PP, PL] not present MS
94n.1: PP, PL] not present MS
95: 4 ; G. M. VI. 237 PP, PL] not present MS
95: 4–6 PL] Moore deleted quote marks around this on PP] only closing quotes on MS
95: 14–15 occasion of something external PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] external occasion MS
95: 19 belongs PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] corresponds MS
95: 27 by the one an occasion is furnished to the action of the other, which is PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] by the action of one an occasion is furnished to the other for MS
95: 28 ; G. M. VI. 251 PL] replaced the 250 on PP] not present MS
95: 31 , which is a modification of the former, is PL] is a modification of the former, MS, PP
96: 3–4 soul or substantial form PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] substantial soul or form MS
96: 4 for this very PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] indeed this MS
96: 8 ; G. M. VI. 256 PP, PL] not present MS
96: 8 conserved” PL] Moore supplied quotes on PP] conserved” MS
96: 19 N. E. 702; PP, PL] not present MS
96n.: PL] not present MS, PP
97: 4 however MS, PL] not present PP
97: 17 motion PL] Moore replaced notion on PP] motion MS
97: 25 ; D. 227; G. VI. 617 PL] Moore's “X” marked a punctuation misprint on PP] not present MS
97: 34 Berkelian PL] corrected in Moore’s hand on PP] Berkelian MS
97n.: 112. PL] not present MS, PP
98: 13 since PL] as MS, PP
98: 23 (unless the descriptive school is in the right) PL] (pace the descriptive school) MS, PP
98: 35 in the words: PL] , when he says MS, PP

Chapter VIII
100: 11 (L. 21) PL] (p. 20) MS, PP
100: 28 aggregate PL] aggregation MS, PP
100: 28–101: 1 ; G. VI. 607 PP, PL] not present MS
101: 10 enquire PL] inquire MS, PP
101: 14 (cf. G. II. 261) PL] not present MS, PP
101: 17–18 “A body can change space, but cannot leave its extension” (D. 263; G. VII. 398) PL] A body can change its space, but not its extension (D. 263; G. VII. 398) PP] A thing can change its space, but not its extension
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

(D. 262) MS

101: 20 ; G. VII. 399 PP, PL] not present MS
101: 24 after PL] after MS, PP
101: 24 doctrine of extension PL] doctrine on monads MS, PP
102: 8 (p. 78) PL] not present MS, PP
102: 17–18 to which it belongs to be PL] which is MS, PP
102: 22 substance itself, PL] substance MS, PP
102: 24 doctrine of extension PL] doc-trine on monads MS, PP
102: 8 (p. 78) PL] not present MS, PP
102: 24–5 presupposes beings endowed with a true unity, since it only derives its reality from that of PL] derives its reality from those MS, PP
103: 26 will have PL] has MS, PP
103: 27 a being by aggregation. PL] an aggregate, MS, PP
103: 28 ... (sic) or PL] or MS, PP (also at 103: 29)
103: 32 atoms PL] replaced in Moore's hand, commenting: “Not according to Epicurus, whose atoms differ in shape and size” after underlining indiscernible PP] the atoms of Epicurus MS
103: 39–104: 3 At the same time ... without reality PP, PL] deleted and stetted MS
104: 24 XI PL] X MS, PP
105: 21 together form PL] form MS, PP
105: 4 exact PL] so in reality MS, PP
105: 7 would PP, PL] could MS
105: 8 ; L. 310–1; G. IV. 482 PP, PL] not present MS
105: 35 or PL] of queried in Moore’s hand on PP] or MS
106: 2 ; L. 301; G. IV. 479 PL] L. 302; G. IV. 479 PP] not present MS
107: 4–5 he regarded as PL] is MS, PP

Chapter IX

108: 8 i.e. PL] but MS, PP
108: 9 , but composed PL] composed MS, PP
108: 22 Théodicée PL] Theodicy MS, PP
108: 28 he PP, PL] Leibniz MS
108: 26 nothing but PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] unless MS
109: 1 and no PL] and inserted in Moore’s hand on PP] no MS
109: 3 that labyrinth PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] these MS
109: 10 ; G. I. 416 PP, PL] not present MS
109: 13 nature PL] it MS, PP
109n.2: [ V. 144 PP, PL] not present MS
109n.3: the following passage PP, PL] also MS
109n.3: greater PL] larger MS, PP
110: 1 ; G. V. 143–5 PP, PL] not present MS
110: 8 consistent with PL] correspond to any MS, PP (Moore queried this)
110n.: (The argument is stated almost exactly in this form in G. VII. 552.) PP, PL] not present MS
111: 6 ; G. IV. 394 PP, PL] not present MS
111: 35 compounding PL] composition of MS, PP
112: 36 result from emphasizing PL] replaced on PP] proceed from the neglect of MS
113: 26 9)]. PL] 278–9]. with Moore adding a queried parenthesis on PP] 278–9}. MS
114: 13–14 (D. 64, 76; L. 311; G. I. 416; II. 279; IV. 482) PP, PL] (D. 64, 76; G. II. 279) MS

114: 24 bare PP, PL] mere MS

114n.: (D. 270; G. VII. 404). Leibniz’s views on intensive quantity were, however, by no means clear. PP, PL] (D. 270). MS

115: 38 or line or other PL] either of line or of any other MS, PP

117: aggregates PL] Moore drew a line to

117n.: (D. 270; G. VII. 404). Leibniz’s views on intensive quantity were, however, by no means clear. PP, PL] (D. 270). MS

118: 14 ; G. VII. 400 PP, PL] not present MS

118: 18 assumes, PP, PL] proceeds MS

118: 19 that PP, PL] on the assumption that MS

119: 7 (D. 263; G. VII. 398) PL] not present MS, PP

119: 17 ; G. VII. 376–7 PP, PL] not present MS


119: 25 substances” PL] substances themselves” MS, PP

119: 25 ; G. VII. 373 PP, PL] not present MS

119: 33–4 ; G. VII. 399, 372 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 7 ; G. VII. 364 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 10 ; G. VII. 373 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 13 ; G. VII. 372 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 22 ; G. VII. 402 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 30 ; G. VII. 415 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 35–6 ; G. VII. 400–402 PP, PL] not present MS

121: 8 illusion PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] allusion MS

Chapter X

118: 14 ; G. VII. 363 PP, PL] not present MS

118: 18 assumes, PP, PL] proceeds MS

118: 19 that PP, PL] on the assumption that MS

119: 7 (D. 263; G. VII. 398) PL] not present MS, PP

119: 17 ; G. VII. 376–7 PP, PL] not present MS


119: 25 substances” PL] substances themselves” MS, PP

119: 25 ; G. VII. 373 PP, PL] not present MS

119: 33–4 ; G. VII. 399, 372 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 7 ; G. VII. 364 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 10 ; G. VII. 373 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 13 ; G. VII. 372 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 22 ; G. VII. 402 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 30 ; G. VII. 415 PP, PL] not present MS

120: 35–6 ; G. VII. 400–402 PP, PL] not present MS

121: 8 illusion PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] allusion MS

MS

121: 34 ; G. VII. 400 PP, PL] not present MS

122: 24 that PP, PL] than MS

122: 35 not yet PL] not MS, PP

122n.1: PL] combining 2 overlapping footnotes at 122: 12, 13 MS, PP


123n.: PP, PL] not present MS

124: 6 ; L. 311; G. IV. 382–3 PP, PL] not present MS

124: 7 §But PP, PL] But MS

124: 13 as it were PP, PL] as it were MS

124: 14 G. II. 438; III. 357 PL] G. III. 357; II. 438) MS, PP

124: 18 thinks PP, PL] says MS

124: 21 (N. E. 230–1; G. V. 205–6) PP, PL] (N. E. 231) MS

124: 28 some body PL] the body MS, PP

124: 28 divisible PL] divided MS, PP

124: 30 ; G. VII. 365–6 PP, PL] not present MS

125: 1 (N. E. 230; G. V. 205) PP, PL] (N. E. 231) MS

125: 17 unity or plurality PL] unity or inserted in Moore’s hand on PP] unity or plurality MS

126: 32 became necessary PL] remained MS, PP

126n.1: Leibniz, however, rejected with ridicule the view, which seems to follow from this theory, that souls are extended. See D. 267; G. VII. 402. PP, PL] not present MS


127: 5 VII. 364; PP, PL] not present MS

127: 10 before and after PP, PL] before and after MS

127: 26–7 ; G. VII. 415 PP, PL] not present MS

127: 30 ; G. V. 142 PP, PL] not present
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

MS
128: 1 elapses: PL] elapses, though MS, PP
128: 2 temporal distance, but not by a temporal length (v. p. 112). PL] temporal distance MS, PP
128: 22–3 (D. 274; G. VII. 408) PP, PL] (D. 268) MS
129: 21 ; G. II. 135 PP, PL] not present MS
129: 22 with Kant PL] in Kant MS, PP
129: 23 for PL] replaced of in Moore’s hand on PP] for MS
129: 23 difference PP, PL] differences MS
129: 27–8 ; L. 221; G. VI. 608 PP, PL] not present MS
130: 4–5 ; L. 341; G. VII. 304 PP, PL] not present MS
130: 6 ; G. VII. 377 PP, PL] not present MS
130: 15 ; G. VI. 598 PP, PL] not present MS
130: 17 actions PL] activities MS, PP
130: 17 which PP, PL] and which MS

Chapter XI
131: 6 ; G. VI. 598 PP, PL] not present MS
131: 8 cannot PL] could not MS, PP
131: 10–11 representations PL] the representation MS, PP
131: 18–19 ; G. VI. 599 PP, PL] not present MS
131: 20 every PL] each MS, PP
131: 21–2 is affected by the other through reaction. PL] each, through reaction, is affected by every other. MS, PP
131: 26–7, according to such a system as his, PL] not present MS, PP
132: 7 “Souls PL] "The soul MS, PP
132: 8 them PL] it MS, PP
132: 9 things without” PP, PL] them MS
132: 9 ; G. VII. 375 PP, PL] not present MS
132: 10 ; G. VII. 410 PP, PL] not present MS
132: 10–12 “What is miraculous, or rather marvellous is that each substance represents the universe from its point of view” (G. III. 464). PP, PL] not present MS
132: 21 ; G. VII. 410 PP, PL] not present MS
132: 23 plurality PL] replaced in Moore’s hand with a query on PP] a multitude MS
132: 23 l’expression de la multitude dans l’unité PP, PL] (no italics) MS
132: 27 It is thus that PL] Thus MS, PP
132: 39 a faculty PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] this power MS
133: 1 such PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] so MS
133: 5 have confirmed PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] confirm MS
133: 5 G. VII. 264 PL] G. VII. 263–4 MS, PP
133: 15 emphasized. PL] sentence deleted in Moore’s hand, citing p. 157n., on PP] emphasized. We must also suppose that clear perceptions differ from those that are confused by greater resemblance to their objects. MS, PP
133: 22 ; L. 301; G. IV. 479 PP, PL] not present MS
133: 24 (D. 210; L. 409; G. VI. 599) PL] (D. 209; L. 407; G. VI. 598) PP] (D. 209) MS
133: 32–3 causes (or grounds) PP, PL] causes MS
133n.: E.g. Reine Vernunft, ed. Hartenstein, 1867, p. 349. PP, PL] e.g. 2nd ed. p. 522 MS
134: 1–6 “I do not … future” PL] no quote marks MS, PP
134: 15 whole PL] all the MS, PP
134: 18–21 “If I could … me” PL] no quote marks MS, PP
135: 7 aperture PL] passage MS, PP
135: 9 ; G. VII. 410 PP, PL] not present MS
135: 13–14 D. 276; G. VII. 410 PP, PL] D. 275 MS
137: 10 à priori: only PL] à priori, since only MS, PP
137: 22 Part PL] Bk. PP] Book MS
137: 26–7 constituting PL] replaced in
Moore’s hand on PP] contributing MS
137: 39 at the PL] from the MS, PP
138: 4–5; G. VII. 412 PP, PL] not present
MS
138: 10 (Met. § 66). PP, PL] (Met. § 66), like a clock that gains or loses. MS
138n.: PP, PL] not present MS

Chapter XII
141: 8–9 (D. 190–1; G. VII. 529; D. 220; L. 230; G. VI. 610) PP, PL] (D. 191 and 220) MS
141: 11 man MS, PL37+] men PP, PL
141: 19 memory of self PL] of self MS
141: 25–6; L. 317; G. IV. 486 PP, PL] not present MS
141: 26–8 "the domination … perfections" PP, PL] no quote marks MS
141: 28–31 "Modifications … other" PP, PL] no quote marks MS
141: 34 and PP, PL] i.e. MS
142: 9 others [G. VI. 615 (D. 225; L. 245)] PL] (G. VI. 615 (D. 225; L. 245)) PP] other monads (D. 225) MS
142: 18 nature PL] depths MS, PP
142: 30 plain PP, PL] evident MS
142: 34 But PP, PL] Both MS
143: 23 mainly PL] replaced on PP] only MS
143n.1: G. IV. 454; V. 171 (N. E. 190–1); F. de C. 62 (D. 182). PL]) N.E. 191; D. 182; G. IV. 454; V. 171. PP] N.E. 191; D. 182; G. IV. 454 MS
143n.2: Cf. § 15, supra. PL] not present MS, PP
143n.3: was often PL] is often MS, PP
143n.4: PL] inserted on PP] not present MS
144n.1: PP, PL] not present MS
144n.2: G. II. 520, 248; VI. 546 (D. 169). PP, PL] (D. 169; G. II. 520, 248) MS
145: 3–4 introduces into the theory of monads PP, PL] uses MS
145: 12–13 ; G. VII. 322 PP, PL] not present MS
145: 15 or possibilities PL37+] and possibilities MS, PP, PL [revisions in BR’s hand in his library copy of PL]
145n.1: G. IV. 511 PL] not present MS, PP
145n.2: PP, PL] not present MS
146: 5 perceived PP, PL] perceives MS
146: 23–4 God (G. IV. 439; II. 438), and the same must be true of the parts of time. PL] God, and the same must be true of the parts of time (G. IV. 439; II. 438). MS, PP
147: 1–4 “If … laws” PP, PL] no quote marks MS
147: 7; G. VI. 546 PP, PL] not present MS
147: 20–1; G. V. 105–7 PP, PL] not present MS
147: 38 We PP, PL] In the first theory, we MS
148: 1–3 unity. It is as regards the nature and degree of this unity that the two theories differ. PP, PL] unity. MS
148: 9–10 [G. VI. 599 (D. 209; L. 408); G. II. 100; IV. 492] PP (with outer ()), PL] (D. 209. G. II. 100; IV. 492) MS
148: 10–11 In the first theory, the dominant PL] The dominant MS, PP
148: 18–19 [G. II. 74; G. VI. 599 (D. 210; L. 409)] PL] (G. II. 58, 74; G. VI. 599 (D. 210; L. 409)) PP] (G. II. 58, 74; D. 210) MS
148: 22 do any PL] any MS
148: 29 [G. VI. 619 (D. 229; L. 258)] PP, PL] (D. 229) MS [Where PP differs only by the final substitution of square brackets for parentheses, such variants are no longer separately recorded.)
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

148: 34 [G. V. 214 (N. E. 240)] PP, PL] (N. E. 240) MS
148n.1: G. VI. 539 (D. 163); G. V. 309 (N. E. 362); G. II. 75, 100. PP, PL] (N. E. p. 362; D. 163; G. II. 75, 100) MS
149: 5–6, since every monad perceives most clearly what is in its own neighbourhood. PL] inserted in light of Moore’s comment: “It is not because they are near that they perceive less clearly.” on PP] not present MS, PP
149: 8 (what is impossible) PP, PL] not present MS
149: 9–10 “Bodies … other” PP, PL] no quote marks MS
149: 9–10 souls, and souls act as if there were no bodies, and both act as if the one influenced the other” [G. VI. 621 (D. 230; L. 264)] PL] … G. VI. 612 PP] bodies, and each as if they influenced each other (D. 230) MS
149: 14 [G. IV. 484 (D. 78; L. 314)] PP, PL] (D. 78) MS
149: 20–1 [G. VII. 412 (D. 278)] PP, PL] (D. 278) MS
150: 9 ; F. de C. pp. 32, 34 PL] Moore’s “X”; he suggested referring to G. PP] not present MS, PP
150: 20 ; N. E. 701 PL] not present MS, PP
150: 21 some PL] an MS, PP
150: 22 bodies PL] body MS, PP
150: 23 G. VI. 539 PP, PL] not present MS
150: 33–151: 2 “The number … phenomena” PP, PL] no quote marks MS
150: 34 beside PP, PL] besides MS
150: 35–6 of the sheep, for example, PP, PL] not present MS
151: 2 results PL] result MS, PP
151: 8 Leibniz’s PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] the MS
152: 9 some real thing which PL] replaced in Moore’s hand on PP] something which really MS
152: 14 the mass. There is one vinculum substantiale for each organic body, i.e. one corresponding to each dominant monad (G. II. 481, 486, 496). PP, PL] the mass. MS
152: 6 (G. II. 481, 486, 496). PP, PL] (G. II. p. ) MS
152: 7 bond PL] compelled, MS, PP
152: 7 bond PL] replaced on PP] form MS
152: 9 (G. II. 481) PL] inserted on PP] (G. II. p. ) MS
152: 9 In later PL] In later MS, PP
152: 16 (cf. G. II. 499) PL] not present MS, PP
152: 25–6 “The body … aggregation” PP, PL] no quote marks MS
153: 2 that I say about true PL] I say about veritable MS, PP
153: 20 space (§ 71) PL] space MS, PP
153n.1: PL] as I should prefer to say marked in Moore’s hand to be transposed on PP] not present MS
153n.2: PP, PL] not present MS
154: 7 ¶There PP, PL] There MS
154: 11 Preformation PP, PL] Preformation MS
155: 23 [G. VII. 531; (D. 193)] PP, PL] (D. 193) MS
155: 28 ; G. V. 148 PP, PL] not present MS
156: 2 G. V. 101; PP, PL] not present MS
156: 13–14 [G. V. 46 (N. E. 47; L. 370); G. VI. 600 (D. 211; L. 411)] PL] L. 369 in PP] [N. E. p. 47][ D. 211] MS
156: 22–3 (N. E. 48; L. 373; G. V. 48) PP, PL] (N. E. 49) MS
156: 26–7 (G. V. 49; N. E. 51; L. 377) PL] (G. V. 50; N. E. 51; L. 377)
(p. 51) MS
156: 33 (G. V. 80; N. E. 84) PL] (G. V. 79; (N. E. 74)) PP] (p. 84) MS
156: 34 reflect PP, PL] think MS
156: 37 perceiving PL] my consciousness of MS, PP
156: 38 have to think that I think of it PL] think that I think MS, PP
156: 39 thinking of it, and so on PL] my thought, and thus MS, PP
157: 1 (G. V. 108; N. E. 118–9) PP, PL] (p. 118–9) MS
157: 29 G. IV. 422; PP, PL] not present MS
157: 31 G. V. 109; PP, PL] not present MS
157: 35 objects. The parts which I do not distinguish are minute1. PP, PL] ob-
jects. MS
158: 2 unconscious. PP, PL] uncon-
scious. But it certainly does not seem to follow that confused prceptions (sic), or even those elements in them to which the confusion is due, are necessarily minute, nor do I know of any passage where Leibniz definitely identifies the two, though he treats them as equivalent. MS
158: 8 name per se PP, PL] name MS
158: 18 (G. V. 197; N. E. 220) PP, PL] (p. 220) MS
158: 21 (G. V. 75; N. E. 80) PL] (G. V. 76; (N. E. 80)) PP] (p. 80) MS
158: 27 itself (G. V. 70; N. E. 74–5)1. PP, PL] itself (N. E. 74–5). It cannot be denied, however, that both in the remainder of this passage, and elsewhere, he falls back into the explanation of truths as psychical dispositions [e.g. G. V. 79, 97 (N. E. 84, 105)]. MS (in PP and PL complete sentence became foot-
note)

Chapter XIV
160: 5 not exactly PP, PL] not MS
160: 5–6 subject which belongs in the main to Psychology. PP, PL] definite Branch of Psychology. MS
160: 6–7 of Chapters II.–V. PP, PL] with which I began my lectures MS
160: 14 mainly PP, PL] properly MS
160: 15 Leibniz says PP, PL] Leibniz truly says MS
160: 16 [G. V. 15 (N. E. 15; D. 95)] PP, PL] (D. 95) MS
160: 23 avoid it. PP, PL] confine myself to Psychology MS
160n.: PL] not present MS, PP
161: 21 [G. V. 66 (N. E. 70)] PL] (G. V. 66, 70 (N. E. 84)) PP] (pp. 70, 84) MS
161: 25 [G. V. 79 (N. E. 84)] PP, PL] (p. 84) MS
161: 32 [G. V. 77, 109 (N. E. 82, 120)] PP] (G. V. 78, 109 (N. E. 82, 120)) PL] (p. 109; G. V. p. 99) MS
162: 31 [G. V. 117 (N. E. 130)] PP, PL] (p. 130) MS
162: 33 except the intellect itself PP, PL] no italics MS
162: 33 [G. V. 100; N. E. 111] PL] not present MS, PP
162: 38–9 perceiving the mind PL] the consciousness of self MS, PP
163: 2 G. V. 93 (N. E. 100) PL] (p. 93) MS
163: 3 G. V. 93 (N. E. 100) PP, PL] not present MS
163: 5 G. V. 100 PL] G. V. 101 PP] not present MS
163: 9 [G. V. 77 (N. E. 81)] PP, PL] (p. 81) MS
163: 29 argument for subjectivity PP, PL] argument MS
164: 9 [G. V. 71 (N. E. 76)] PP, PL] (p. 76) MS
164: 17 Sensations of colours PL] Col-
ours MS, PP
164: 20 any PL] any MS, PP
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

164: 25–6 an existent PP, PL] a thing MS
165: 14 [G. V. 99 (N. E. 109)] PP, PL] (p. 109) MS
165: 19–20 actual thoughts which correspond to it PL] thought to which it corresponds MS, PP
165: 20 be before PL] exist previous to MS, PP
165n.: Cf. also G. III. 659 (D. 236); IV. 451. PP, PL] Cf. also D. 236. MS
166: 3 are not essentially constituents of PP, PL] do not, as such, exist in MS
166: 8–10 knowledge, ideas and truths "are only natural habits, i.e. active and passive dispositions and aptitudes" (N. E. 105; G. V. 97). PP, PL] "truths are not thoughts, but habits and aptitudes, natural or acquired" (N. E. p. 84). MS
166: 16 though PL] exist previous to MS, PP
166: 24 whilst PP, PL] while MS
166: 25 I think PL] , I think, PP
166: 28 G. IV. 357 PP, PL] not present MS
166: 32–3 or contradiction PL] following Moore's query, inserted on PP] not present MS
166: 34 [G. V. 14 (D. 94; N. E. 13)] PL] [G. V. 14 (D. 94; N. E. 14)] PP] (D. p. 94) MS
167: 6 G. V. 391 PP, PL] not present MS
167: 8 truths (N. E. 499; G. V. 415) PL] truths (p. 499) PP] truth (p. 499) MS
167: 10 ib. PL] (G. V. 415 (N. E. 439)) PP] (N. E. p. 439) MS
167: 13–14 [G. V. 117 (N. E. 130)] PP, PL] (p. 130) MS
167: 28 (1684) PL] not present MS, PP
167: 30–1 [G. IV. 425 (D. 31)] PL] (p. 30) MS, PP
167: 31 D. 31 PL] replaced as 30 in Moore's hand on PP] 30 MS
168: 16 distinctly PP, PL] distinctly MS

168: 39 G. V. 92 PP, PL] not present MS
169: 6 [G. V. 279 (N. E. 325)] PP, PL] [N. E. p. 325] MS
169: 10 G. V. 275 PL] G. V. 276 PP] not present MS
169: 18 G. V. 290 PP, PL] not present MS
169: 23 [G. V. 281 (N. E. 328)] PL] [G. V. 282 (N. E. 328) PP] (p. 328) MS
169: 27 G. V. 92 PP, PL] not present MS
169: 34–170: 6 “Telescopes and microscopes,” he says, “have not been so useful to the eye as this instrument would be in adding to the capacity of thought” (G. VII. 14). “If we had it, we should be able to reason in metaphysics and morals in much the same way as in geometry and analysis” (G. VII. 21).
170: 14 G. V. 92 PP, PL] not present MS
170: 17 G. V. 460 PP, PL] not present MS
170: 31 rather than PP, PL] as opposed to MS
170n.: PP, PL] not present MS

Chapter XV
173: 6 his PL] His MS, PP
173: 22 e.g. G. V. 419 (N. E. 504); G. VI. 614 (D. 224; L. 242) PL] 243 in PP]
[N. E. 504 D. 224] MS
173: 29 G. IV. 406 PP, PL] not present MS
173: 32 [G. VI. 614 (D. 224; L. 242)] PP, PL] [D. 224] MS
173n.1: PP, PL] not present MS
173n.2: (N. E. 714) PL] MS
173n.1: Vol. I PL] not present
173n.2: Vol. I PL] not present
173n.2: (N. E. 714) PL] MS
〈perhaps not intended as footnote; references in text but not yet one to Stein〉
174: 3 Ontological Argument PP, PL] ontological argument MS
〈also at 174: 4〉
174: 23–4 G. V. 339 PP, PL] not present
174: 18 [G. VII. 305 (D. 103; L. 343)] PL] 344 in PP] [D. 103] MS
178: 17 ; G. VII. 311 PL] 310 in PP] not present MS
178: 18 [G. VII. 305 (D. 103; L. 343)] PL] 344 in PP] [D. 103] MS
178: 19 from PP, PL] of MS
178: 23 monads, MS, PL] 377+ monad PP, PL] (revision in BR’s hand in his copy of PL, with printed comma patch glued on)
178: 3 relations’. PP, PL] relations [G. II. 438.] MS
178: 26–7 [G. VI. 614 (D. 225; L. 243)] PL] 615 and 245 in PP] [D. 225] MS
178: 38–179: 1 ; F. de C. 24 PL] Moore suggested referring to G. on PP] not present MS
178n.: G. II. 438. PL] not present but moved from 178: 23 MS, PP
179: 4 ; F. de C. 34 PL] Moore suggested referring to G. on PP] not present MS
179: 11–12 since it is proved, has a ground PP, PL] has a ground, since it is proved MS
179n.: G. VII. 365 (D. 244); 379; IV. 344. PL] 244–5 in PP] D 244–5; G VII. 379; IV 344. MS
180: 4 Hence we cannot, PP, PL] We cannot, therefore, MS
180: 7 [G. V. 14 (D. 94; N. E. 14)] PP, PL] [D. 94] MS
180: 14–15 [G. VI. 230; VII. 305 (D. 103; L. 343)] PL] 344 in PP] [D. 103; G. VI. 230] MS
180: 18–19 [G. VI. 614 (D. 225; L. 243)] PL] 615 and 245 in PP] [D. 225] MS
180: 29–30 If, to mend matters, we were to say that truths actually constitute God’s understanding PP, PL] Moreover, if the truth itself exists in God’s mind MS
180: 30 them PP, PL] it MS
181: 29 226 PL] 230 MS, PP
183: 30 D. 79 PP, PL] not present MS
184: 3 G. V. 99 PP, PL] not present MS
184: 4–5 G. VI. 578 PP, PL] not present MS
III. Revisions between the MS, Proofs & First Edition

184: 15 led PL] made MS, PP
184n.: G. VI. 615 (D. 225; L. 244–5) PL] 245 in PP] not present MS
184n.: G. IV. 515 PL] 516 in PP] not present MS
185: 20 G. V. 339 PP, PL] not present MS
185: 36 (§ 106) PL] not present MS, PP
186: 5–6 (D. 178; F. de C. 38). Now place, in his system, is a mere attribute of what is placed PL] no F. de C. 38 reference, Moore suggesting referring to G. on PP] not present MS
186: 8–10 “is …… the original simple substance, of which all created or derivative monads are products, born, so to speak, PL] “is the original simple substance, of which all the monads are products, born MS, PP
186: 12 of the Discours de Métaphysique PP, PL] not present MS
186: 13–22 “Created substances depend on God, who conserves them, and even produces them continually by a kind of emanation, as we produce our thoughts. For God ……views all aspects of the world in all possible ways; the result of each view of the universe, as if seen from a certain place, is a substance expressing the universe conformably to this point of view, if God sees fit to make his thought effective and produce this substance. PL] “God conserves created substances, and even produces them continually by a kind of emanation, as we produce our thoughts. God perceives the universe from each point of view; the result of each view, as if from a certain place, is a substance expressing the universe from this point of view, if God makes his thought effective and produces this substance. MS, PP
186: 26 pantheism². PL] pantheism². And this appears also in the assertion that everything is a product of God and nothing (Erdmann, Gesch. p. 64, To Schulenberg v. Guhrauer, Leibnizens deutsche Schriften, I. 411). MS, PP
186: 28 that PL] replaced on PP] whither MS
186: 28 to Spinozism. PL] following Moore’s query “Where ought it to lead him?” inserted on PP] not present MS
186n.1: PL] not present MS, PP
187: 4 merely PL] not present MS, PP
187: 10–11 its generic definition PL] inserted in Moore’s hand on PP] general MS
187: 31 its generic definition PL] inserted in Moore’s hand on PP] the genus MS (fol. 268/8a)
188: 26–7 quite arbitrary what propositions God is to believe PL] replaced on PP] strictly meaningless to assert that God has any knowledge of the truth MS
188n.: PP, PL] not present MS
188n.: Stein, Leibniz und Spinoza PL] Stein, Leibniz und Spinoza PP
189: 13 and absolute PL] or absolute MS, PP
189: 16 40, 41 MS, PL] 41, 42 PP
189: 16–17 ; G. VI. 613 (D. 225; L. 239) PP, PL] (D 223–4) MS
189: 32 G. VI. 378 PP, PL] not present MS
189n.: G. VII. 303 (D. 101; L. 340) PP, PL] (D. 101) MS
189n.: G. VII. 305 (D. 103; L. 342) PL] 344 in PP] p. 103 MS
189n.: on the next page PP, PL] p. 104 MS

Chapter XVI
192: 4 in proportion as PL] to the extent that MS, PP
192: 5 properly concerns PL] concerns properly MS, PP
192: 6 bare PL] naked MS, PP
192: 27 resolved PP, PL] determined MS
192n.3: V. 163–4 PL] V. 168 in PP] not present MS
193: 14–15 (G. VII. 408–9; D. 273–4) PP, PL] (D. 203, 274) MS
193n.1: G. II. 420; III. 401 (D. 171); V. 164 (N. E. 183); VII. 379. PP, PL] N. E. p. 184; D. p. 171; G. II. 420; G. VII. 379 MS
Russell originally used roman numerals as lecture labels, then arabic numbers in rewriting lectures into chapters. After the RA foliation is his own numbering within chapters and any previous numbering, which sometimes obscures the original number. “[1]” is used for the first chapter leaf when he numbered the remainder of a chapter. Where a chapter’s first leaf became part of another chapter, that leaf also shows an inferred “[1]”. Deletions in chapter titles, and former chapter titles, are indicated by strike-out text.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA foliation/ Russell’s</td>
<td>Chapter label Previous label</td>
<td>RA foliation/ Russell’s</td>
<td>Chapter label Previous label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 82/6a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fol. 123/5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 83/7</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 84/8</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 85/9</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 86/10</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 87/11</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 88/12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 89/12a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 90/13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 91/14(12)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>fol. 124[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 92/15(12a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fol. 125/2</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 93/16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fol. 126/3</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 94/17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fol. 127/4</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter Lecture V. The Identity of Indiscernibles and the Law of Continuity. Possibility and Compossibility**

| fol. 95[1]             |                              | fol. 128/5a            | 6                            |
| fol. 96/2              | V                            | fol. 129/5             | VII                          |
| fol. 97/3              | V                            | fol. 130/6a            |                              |
| fol. 98/4              | V                            | fol. 131/6             | VII                          |
| fol. 99/5              | V                            | fol. 132/7             | VII                          |
| fol. 100/6a            |                              | fol. 133/8             | VII                          |
| fol. 101/6             |                              | fol. 134/9             | VII                          |
| fol. 102/7             | V                            | fol. 135/9a            | VII                          |
| fol. 103/8             | V                            | fol. 136/10            | VII                          |
| fol. 104/8a(9)         | 5                            | fol. 137/11            | VII                          |
| fol. 105/9             | V                            | fol. 138/12            | VII                          |
| fol. 106/9a            |                              | fol. 139/13            | VII                          |
| fol. 107/10(9a)        | 5                            | fol. 140/13a           |                              |
| fol. 108/10a(10)       | V                            | fol. 141/14            | VII                          |
| fol. 109/11            | V                            | fol. 142/14a(12)       | VII                          |
| fol. 110/12            | V                            | fol. 143/14b(13)       | VII                          |
| fol. 111/13            | V                            | fol. 144/15            | VII                          |
| fol. 112/14            | V                            | fol. 145/16            | VII                          |
| fol. 113/15            | V                            | fol. 146/17            | VII                          |
| fol. 114/16            | V                            | fol. 147/18            | VII                          |
| fol. 115/17            | 5                            | fol. 148/18a           | VII                          |
| fol. 116/18            | 5                            | fol. 149/19            | VII                          |
|                         |                              | fol. 150/20            | VII                          |
|                         |                              | fol. 151/21            | VII                          |
|                         |                              | fol. 152/22            | VII                          |
|                         |                              | fol. 153/22a           |                              |
|                         |                              | fol. 154/23            | VII                          |
|                         |                              | fol. 155/24(10a)       | VII                          |
|                         |                              | fol. 156/25            | VII                          |

**Chapter Lecture VI. Why Did Leibniz Believe in an External World?**

<p>| fol. 117[1]            |                              | fol. 157/26            | VII                          |
| fol. 118/2             | VI                           | fol. 158/27            | VII                          |
| fol. 119/2a            | 6                            |                              |                              |
| fol. 120/3             | VI                           |                              |                              |
| fol. 121/4             | VI                           |                              |                              |
| fol. 122/4a            | 6                            |                              |                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA foliation/</th>
<th>Chapter label</th>
<th>Previous label</th>
<th>RA foliation/</th>
<th>Chapter label</th>
<th>Previous label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russell’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159/28(11a)</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>195/10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160/29</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>196/11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161/30</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>197/11a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162/31</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>198/12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200/14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201/15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202/16[1]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>[XI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Lecture VIII.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture XI.</td>
<td>The Nature of Monads in General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philosophy of Matter</td>
<td>(continued), (b) As Explaining Continuity and Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 163/1</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>fol. 203/16a(1a)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 164/2</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>fol. 204/17(2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 165/3</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 166/4</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 167/5(12)</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 168/6(13)</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 169/7(14)</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 170/8</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Lecture IX. The Labyrinth of the Continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 171/1(5)</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 172/1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 173/2(6)(3)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 174/2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 175/2b(2a)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 176/2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 177/2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 177/3(7)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 178/4(8)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 179/5</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 180/6</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 181/6a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 182/7(9)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 183/8(10)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 184/8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 185/9(11)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Lecture X. The Theory of Space and Time and Its Relation to Monadism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 186/1[1]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 187/2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 188/3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 189/4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 190/5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 191/6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 192/7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 193/8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 194/9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Lecture XII.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture XII.</td>
<td>Soul and Body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soul and Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 217[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 218/1a</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 219/2</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 220/3</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 221/3a</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 222/4</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 223/5</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 224/6</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 225/7</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 226/8</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lecture XIII. Details of the Doctrine of Monads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foliation</th>
<th>Chapter Label</th>
<th>Previous Chapter Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fol. 227/9</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 228/9a</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 229/10</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 230/11</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 231/12/[1]</td>
<td>XII [XIII]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chapter XIII. Confused and Unconscious Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foliation</th>
<th>Chapter Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fol. 231/12/[1]</td>
<td>[XIII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 232/13(2)</td>
<td>XII [XIII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 233/14(3)</td>
<td>XII [XIII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 234/14a</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 235/15/4</td>
<td>XII [XIII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 236/16/5</td>
<td>XII [XIII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 237/17/6</td>
<td>XII [XIII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 238/1/7</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 239/2/8</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 240/3/9</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 241/4/10</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 242/5/11</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 243/6</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lecture XIV. Leibniz’s Theory of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foliation</th>
<th>Chapter Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fol. 244/[1]</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 245/1a</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 246/2</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 247/2a</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 248/3</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 249/3a</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 250/3a</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 251/3b</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 252/3c</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 253/4</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 254/5</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 255/6</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 256/7</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 257</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chapter XVI. Lecture XVII. Leibniz’s Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foliation</th>
<th>Chapter Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fol. 257/7a</td>
<td>out of order in file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 258/8</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 259/9</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 260/[1]</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 261/2</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 262/3</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>