

Quaestiones Infnitae

PUBLICATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XXXVII

Zeno, The Leiden-Utrecht Research Institute of Philosophy
Heidelberglaan 8
3584 CS Utrecht
The Netherlands

© J.J.F.M. Bos
All rights reserved
ISBN 90-393-2975-3 (ISSN 0927-3395)
Cover design: Het Bona-team

The Correspondence between Descartes
and Henricus Regius

*De briefwisseling tussen Descartes
en Henricus Regius
(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)*

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Utrecht
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus, Prof. Dr. W.H. Gispen,
ingevolge het besluit van het College voor Promoties
in het openbaar te verdedigen
op maandag 4 maart 2002 des middags te 16.15 uur

door

Jan Jacobus Frederik Maria Bos

geboren op 10 februari 1969, te Boxtel

Promotor:
Prof. Dr. Th. Verbeek
Faculty of Philosophy
Utrecht University

The research for this thesis was made possible by a grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

(Several misprints have been corrected in this electronic version.
June 2002, EJB.)

*Ter herinnering aan mijn vader.
Voor mijn moeder.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the staff of the Library of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District and the Reformed College (Debrecen), the National Library of Medicine (Maryland), and Utrecht University Library. My thanks are also due to Thomas Gariepy for kindly sending me a microfilm of Regius' *Physiologia*. I am much indebted to Jan de Grauw for his willingness to correct what I believed to be proper English. It goes without saying that the responsibility for the errors that remain are mine. I should also like to express my gratitude to Prof. C. Heesakkers and the participants in the Neo-Latin Seminar (under the aegis of the Huizinga Institute) for patiently listening to and correcting my translation of Descartes' letters to Regius. Special thanks are due to my dear friend Jeroen van de Ven, who carefully read my manuscript and made several valuable suggestions. I enjoyed our many and extensive talks on science, life and the absurd, which I hope we will continue for some time.

Writing a dissertation can be a lonely task, but I was fortunate to have my research imbedded in the project *Towards a New Edition of Descartes* at the Utrecht Faculty of Philosophy, which provided a pleasant and stimulating environment. During my research I profited greatly from the database of Descartes' correspondence developed at the Department of the History of Philosophy, and I thank the students who assisted in creating and maintaining this database over the last five years: Hans Diepenveen, Hanneke Wit, Roeland Roelofs and Maarten van Houte. I would like to express my gratitude to my fellow participants in the project, Matthijs van Otegem and Corinna Vermeulen. During our discussions at the weekly seminar on Descartes' correspondence I greatly benefited from their insight and expertise. The initiator and director of the project, Prof. Theo Verbeek, has been a continuous source of inspiration, whose encouragement and criticism helped me to tackle many difficulties. He has been a magnificent *Doktorvater*.

All this being said, I could not have completed my dissertation successfully without the love and patience of Hella.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	vii
Abbreviations	x
Preface	xi
Introduction to the Correspondence	
1. History of the manuscripts	xv
1.1. Descartes' letters to Regius	xv
1.1.1. Descartes' legacy in Stockholm	xv
1.1.2. The first dispute between Clerselier and Regius	xvi
1.1.3. The letters sent to Regius	xx
1.2. Regius' letters to Descartes	xx
1.2.1. The second dispute between Clerselier and Regius	xx
1.2.2. After Clerselier: Legrand, Baillet and Marmion	xxii
2. Description and assessment of the sources	xxiv
2.1. <i>Lettres de Mr Descartes</i> , ed. Clerselier (1657)	xxiv
2.1.1. Sources	xxv
2.1.2. Editorial problems	xxvii
2.1.3. Clerselier's interventions: an outline	xxx
2.1.4. Clerselier's interventions: Descartes' letters to Regius	xxxiv
2.2. <i>La vie de Mr Des-Cartes</i> , by A. Baillet (1691)	xxxv
2.3. The Exemplaire de l'Institut	xxxviii
2.3.1. The Clerselier collection of Regius' letters to Descartes	xl
2.4. Debrecen	xli
3. The present edition	xliii
3.1. The arrangement of the correspondence	xliii
3.2. The establishment of the text	xliv
3.2.1. Clerselier's <i>Lettres de Mr Descartes</i>	xliv
3.2.2. Baillet's <i>La vie de Mr Des-Cartes</i>	xlvi
3.2.3. Exemplaire de l'Institut	xlvi
3.2.4. Debrecen	xlvi
Introductory notes to the Correspondence	
1. The calendars in the Dutch Republic	xlvii
2. Utrecht University 1636–1650	xlvii
2.1. Disputations	li
2.2. Academic holidays	lii
3. Descartes' whereabouts 1635–1650	liii

Table of Contents

The Correspondence between Descartes and Henricus Regius

1.	Regius to Descartes	[8/] 18 August 1638	3
2.	Descartes to Regius	[between 19 and 23 August 1638]	10
3.	Regius to Descartes	[early February 1639]	12
4.	Regius to Descartes	19/29 March 1639	15
5.	Æmilius to Descartes	[late March or early April 1639]	16
6.	Regius to Descartes	17 May 1639	20
7.	Regius to Descartes	14 [24] July 1639	23
8.	Regius to Descartes	[first half of September 1639]	26
9.	Regius to Descartes	[first half of November 1639]	28
10.	Regius to Descartes	3 December 1639	30
11.	Regius to Descartes	[early 1640]	32
12.	Regius to Descartes	5 [15] May 1640	37
13.	Descartes to Regius	[24 May 1640]	41
14.	Regius to Descartes	20/30 May 1640	49
15.	Descartes to Regius	[June 1640]	51
16.	Regius to Descartes	7 October 1640 [NS?]	54
17.	Descartes to Regius	[April 1641]	57
18.	Regius to Descartes	21 April [1 May] 1641	60
19 A.	Descartes to Regius	[early May 1641]	63
B.	Descartes to Regius	[early May 1641]	64
20.	Descartes to Regius	[first half of May 1641]	70
21.	Descartes to Regius	[second half of May 1641]	72
22.	Descartes to Regius	[June 1641]	74
23.	Descartes to Regius	[July 1641]	76
24.	Descartes to Regius	[between June and October 1641]	78
25.	Descartes to Regius	[between June and October 1641]	80
26.	Descartes to Regius	[before mid-October 1641]	83
27.	Descartes to Regius	[Autumn 1641]	85
28.	Descartes to Regius	[November 1641]	87
29.	Descartes to Regius	[second half of December 1641]	90
30.	Regius to Descartes	[14/] 24 January 1642	95
31.	Descartes to Regius	[late January 1642]	98
32.	Regius to Descartes	[23 January/] 2 February 1642	110
33.	Descartes to Regius	[3 or 4 February 1642]	113
34.	Descartes to Regius	6 February 1642	119
35.	Descartes to Regius	[6 February 1642]	122
36.	Regius to Descartes	17/27 February 1642	125
37.	Regius to Descartes	[23 February/] 5 March 1642	126
38.	Descartes to Regius	[between 5 and c.10 March 1642]	130
39.	Descartes to Regius	[between c.10 and c.25 March 1642]	137
40.	Descartes to Regius	[between 25 and 31 March 1642]	139

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

41.	Regius to Descartes	[21/] 31 March 1642	141
42.	Descartes to Regius	[early April 1642]	144
43.	Regius to Descartes	4 April 1642	146
44.	Regius to Descartes	1 June 1642 [NS?]	149
45.	Descartes to Regius	[June 1642]	152
46.	Regius to Descartes	[Winter 1642–1643]	157
47.	Regius to Descartes	[before May 1643]	163
48.	Regius to Descartes	[between early December 1642 and May 1643]	165
49.	Regius to Descartes	[late July or August 1643]	167
50.	Regius to Descartes	[9/] 19 February 1644	172
51.	Regius to Descartes	4 June 1644	174
52.	Regius to Descartes	[late July or August 1644]	176
53.	Regius to Descartes	[8/]18 November 1644	178
54.	Regius to Van Hogelande	[8/]18 November 1644	180
55.	Regius to Descartes	[13/] 23 June 1645	181
56.	Regius to Descartes	6 July 1645 [NS?]	185
57.	Descartes to Regius	[July 1645]	187
58.	Regius to Descartes	23 July 1645 [NS?]	189
59.	Descartes to Regius	[late July or early August 1645]	192

APPENDIX

Henricus Regius, <i>Physiologia</i> (1641)	195
Introduction	195
Textual note	196
<i>Physiologia</i> Ia	199
<i>Physiologia</i> Ib	205
<i>Physiologia</i> IIa	211
<i>Physiologia</i> IIb	217
<i>Physiologia</i> IIIa	223
<i>Physiologia</i> IIIb	231
<i>Physiologia</i> VI (Sectio I; Sectio II (partly))	241
Biographical Lexicon	249
A Concise Regius Chronicle	257
Bibliography	261
Concordances on CLE (1657), CLE (1663), AT and the Present Edition	280
Index of special subjects in the Commentary	282
Index of Names	283
Samenvatting	289
Curriculum Vitae	292

ABBREVIATIONS

Editions

- AM *Correspondance de Descartes*, Ch. Adam and G. Milhaud (eds.), 8 vols., 1936–1963.
- AT *Œuvres de Descartes*, Ch. Adam and P. Tannery (eds.), 11 vols., 1964–1974.
- B *Descartes/Regius, Il carteggio. Le polemiche*, R. Bordoli (ed.), 1996
- CLE *Lettres de Mr Descartes*, Cl. Clerselier (ed.), 3 vols., 1657–67.
- CM *Correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne*, C. de Waard *et al.* (eds.), 18 vols., 1945–1991.
- CSM(K) *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, J. Cottingham *et al.* (eds.), 3 vols., 1991.
- M *Opere scientifiche di Descartes*, vol. I, *La Biologia*, G. Micheli (ed.), 1966.
- NH *Testimonium Academiae Ultrajectinae, et Narratio Historica*, Utrecht, 1643.
- Querelle* Descartes/Schoock, *La Querelle d'Utrecht*, Th. Verbeek (ed.), 1988.
- RL *Lettres à Regius*, G. Rodis-Lewis (ed.), 1959.
- Vie *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*, A. Baillet, 1691.

Reference works

- Acta The minutes of the Senate of Utrecht University, in: *Acta et decreta Senatus; Vroedschapsresolutiën*, G. Kernkamp, 3 vols., 1936–1940, vol. I.
- BLA *Biographisches Lexikon der hervorragenden Ärzte aller Zeiten und Völker*, W. Haberling *et al.* (eds.), 6 vols., 1929–1935.
- BLGNP *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme*, D. Nauta *et al.* (eds.), 4 vols., 1978–...
- DBPh *Dictionary of Seventeenth-Century British Philosophers*, A. Pyle (ed.), 2 vols., 2000.
- DNB *Dictionary of National Biography*.
- DNF *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, J. Balteau *et al.* (eds.), 18 vols., 1932–...
- DSN *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, C.C. Gillespie (ed.), 16 vols., New York, 1970–1980.
- NNBW *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, P.C. Molhuysen *et al.* (eds.), 10 vols., 1974.
- Resolutiën* Resolutions of the Utrecht Vroedschap (city council) concerning the University, in: *Acta et decreta Senatus; Vroedschapsresolutiën*, G. Kernkamp, 3 vols., 1936–1940, vol. I.

Other abbreviations

- DTB Doop-, trouw- en begraafboeken, Utrecht Archives (unpublished).
- ExI *Exemplaire de l'Institut*.
- ÆM/D Æmilius to Descartes
- D/R Descartes to Regius
- R/D Regius to Descartes
- R/VH Regius to Van Hogelande

PREFACE

*Il serait dès lors non moins essentiel, pour une étude approfondie de Descartes, d'avoir sa correspondance bien classée chronologiquement.
Or c'est ici que commencent les difficultés.*

Paul Tannery¹

In 1638 the Dutch philosopher and physician Henricus Regius (1598–1679) introduced himself to René Descartes (1596–1650), allegedly because he owed his appointment as professor of theoretical medicine at Utrecht University to his being a Cartesian.² During the following years Regius established himself as the main advocate of Cartesianism at Utrecht. In fact, he was the first university professor to teach Cartesian ideas and to publish a number of disputations, which provide a fairly complete picture of Cartesian natural philosophy.

According to a passage in Descartes' *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (1642) Regius was converted to Cartesianism by reading the *Météores* and the *Dioptrique* (1637).³ He seems to have developed a system of natural philosophy of his own, based on Cartesian principles, even before he introduced himself to Descartes. In Regius' view he owed his chair in medicine at Utrecht University to his expertise on the New Philosophy, which was the reason why he got in touch with the French philosopher in 1638 (R/D 1). In the correspondence that followed Regius discussed his projects with Descartes. As a result of these exchanges several series of disputations were submitted for discussion at the university, the most extensive being the six disputations Regius titled *Physiologia*.⁴

Descartes showed Regius his work too. He did not only send a first version of the *Meditationes* (1641) for comment to Regius (D/R 15), but also a copy of *Le Monde* (D/R 19B), the text of which Descartes had finished in 1633 but left unpublished because of the condemnation of Galileo. Regius probably used *Le Monde* in his second series of disputations, *De illustribus aliquot quaestionibus physiologicis*, which was submitted for

1 TANNERY 1912–1950, VI, 293.

2 For literature on Descartes up to 1960, see SEBBA 1964; sources published between 1960 and 1984 are listed in CHAPPELL/DONEY 1987. For critical accounts of publications after 1984, consult the *Bulletin cartésien* published in *Archives de philosophie*. Recent biographies of Descartes are GAUKROGER 1995 and RODIS-LEWIS 1995. Studies on Regius include DE VRIJER 1917, DE VRIJER 1929, DECHANGE 1966, ROTHSCHUH 1968, FARINA 1975, FARINA 1977, GARIEPY 1990, VERBEEK 1993A (a collection of essays on Regius by various authors), VERBEEK 1994, VERBEEK 2000. Except for REGIUS 1640A and REGIUS 1650A, no modern editions of his works are available. For the biographical data of Regius, see my *Regius chronicle*. The only available modern biography is DE VRIJER 1917.

3 AT VII 582–583.

4 REGIUS 1641A.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

discussion in November and December 1641.⁵ These disputations displayed the criticism of Aristotelian philosophy far more radically than the previous disputations. As a result, they caused great turmoil. The theologians led by Gisbertus Voetius immediately initiated disputations to vindicate Aristotelian philosophy, and attacked Regius and the New Philosophy. In January 1642, at the height of the Utrecht Crisis, Descartes helped Regius formulate an answer to the accusations, part of which was indeed used by Regius to write his *Responsio*. This pamphlet, published in February 1642, turned out to be highly offensive and was the immediate cause for the condemnation of Cartesian philosophy by the city council of Utrecht.

After the Utrecht Crisis Regius continued to work on a book on natural philosophy. As early as 1641, he intended to publish a compendium of the New Philosophy, but Descartes advised against it (D/R 17). However, when Descartes published his *Principia* in 1644, Regius felt free to continue the project. After Descartes had read the manuscript, he threatened to dissociate himself publicly from its contents (D/R 59). Regius, however, did not yield to Descartes, although some paragraphs to which Descartes had objected in particular were left out of the *Fundamenta physices* when it appeared in 1646. This could not satisfy Descartes, who was condescending about both the book and its author in the preface of his *Principes* (1647). Regius reacted by printing a short placard in which he set forth the theory on mind which had been disputed by Descartes.⁶

Descartes found in Regius an intelligent champion of Cartesianism whom he supported in his battle against Aristotelian adversaries. The Utrecht professor also broadened Descartes' philosophical scope; Regius drew his attention to matters he had not previously investigated (D/R 28). However, although Regius embraced Cartesianism, he did not endorse every aspect of Descartes' philosophy. In the end, Regius' different ideas on method and metaphysics caused the divergence of opinions. In this way Regius' thoughts formed a prelude to the direction which the development of Dutch Cartesianism was to take in later years.

As Verbeek observed in 1994, apart from De Vrijer's theological thesis of 1917 little has been done so far to establish the significance of Regius' work or study the way in which he took up Descartes' ideas and amalgamated them with his own. Consequently, Regius appears occasionally in the Descartes literature either as a hothead who spoiled Descartes' chances or as a crude empiricist who was insufficiently clever to understand Descartes' metaphysics.⁷ Regius was portrayed in this way by Baillet (*Vie*, 1691) and his view has persisted well into this century.⁸ Bouillier does not doubt Regius' intellectual

5 REGIUS 1641B.

6 *Explicatio mentis humanae*, 1647.

7 VERBEEK 1994, 533–534.

8 COHEN 1920, 577; DUKER 1989, II.

Preface

capacities, but his account is unsatisfactory because it is biased in favour of Descartes.⁹ Bouillier still depends heavily on Baillet and pays no attention to the academic and religious situation in the Dutch Republic. The first objective study of Regius' life and work is DE VRIJER 1917, but the author was not able to give Regius full credit since he lacked Regius' disputations and his response to Voetius. This deficiency was somewhat remedied by the rediscovery of the *Responsio*.¹⁰ Dibon gives a description of the history and the state of affairs in Regius research up to 1950, but presents no new facts.¹¹ A new impetus was the rediscovery of Regius' *Physiologia*. The preliminary study of Dechange was followed by Roths Schuh, who concluded that at the time of the *Physiologia* Regius did not know Descartes' *L'Homme*. Consequently, Roths Schuh credited Regius with more originality and independence than his predecessors had done. His conclusion was the reason for Farina to explore influences on Regius other than Cartesian.¹² Verbeek reports the rediscovery of Regius' important disputation REGIUS 1641B.¹³ However, as his work aimed a complete view of the history of Descartes and the Dutch, it contributed little to Regius research. Although some contributors of VERBEEK 1993A clarify several conceptual issues, none of these explicitly deal with the correspondence or with REGIUS 1641B. Van Ruler and Fowler pay some attention to REGIUS 1641B and the *Responsio*, but only to oppose Descartes/Regius to Voetius.¹⁴ Regius' first disputation at Utrecht University, rediscovered by De Waard and published in the new edition of AT in 1971 (AT III 726–734), and its follow-up, have been completely neglected.¹⁵ The complete lack of a monograph study on Regius in the history of medicine is only partly resolved by Gariépy, who offers a detailed study of Regius' *Physiologia*.¹⁶ However, his — in my view unwarranted — assumption that Regius knew *L'Homme*, diminishes the value of his conclusions regarding the originality of Regius' work.

In sum, none of the studies on Regius from DIBON 1950 onwards is satisfactory. Although the necessary sources have become available in the past decades, there is as yet no comprehensive study on Regius and his relation to Descartes. The major obstacle to this enterprise is, I think, the defective state of the available editions of the Descartes–Regius correspondence. For a clear understanding of the relation between Descartes and Regius, and for an objective and thorough assessment of Regius' philosophical and medical concepts, a critical edition of the correspondence between Descartes and Regius is an essential prerequisite. It is here where the problems arise. The actual text of the letters which were exchanged between Descartes and Regius is unknown. In 1657, Clerselier published 18 minutes of Descartes' part of the correspondence. All

9 BOUILLIER 1854, I.

10 DE VRIJER 1929.

11 DIBON 1950.

12 FARINA 1975; FARINA 1977.

13 VERBEEK 1992A.

14 VAN RULER 1995; FOWLER 1999.

15 REGIUS 1640A; REGIUS 1640B.

16 GARIÉPY 1990.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

that remains of Regius' letters to Descartes are abstracts and quotations in Baillet's biography (*Vie*). In 1973, Esze published two unknown letters of Descartes to Regius.¹⁷ The order of the letters as they were published in the editions of Adam/Tannery (1964–1971: AT), Adam/Milhaud (1936–1963: AM), Rodis-Lewis (1959: RL) and Bordoli (1997: B) is based on that of Clerselier, but since the rediscovery of *Physiologia* scholars have contested the dates of various letters.¹⁸ However, none of the editors so far has extensively used Regius' disputations as a means to arrive at a more exact date.

The aim of my research is to provide a critical reconstruction of the correspondence between Descartes and Regius. The most dramatic differences with previous editions concern Descartes' part of the correspondence. I have discovered that several letters as published by Clerselier consist in fact of fragments of many more letters.¹⁹ Further, I have revised almost every date established by AT, either narrowing them down or giving the letters an altogether new place in the correspondence. One of the most interesting features of the present edition is that it points out the many reoccurring passages from Descartes' letters in Regius' *Physiologia*. As regards Regius' letters to Descartes, in many cases I have been able to establish their precise date. Moreover, in clearing Baillet's at times confused way of presentation, I have arrived at an order of Regius' letters and their context which sharply contrasts with the standard view. In addition, my examination of Baillet's biography has yielded several passages relevant to Regius' letters which are not found in AT. Finally, the use of the many available sources, both published and unpublished, has resulted in a comprehensive historical annotation, conspicuously absent in AT, on the specific Dutch and especially Utrecht context of the relation between Regius and Descartes.

The present edition of their correspondence will be fundamental to future research into Regius and Descartes. It is the starting point for the establishment of a more exact view of Regius' philosophical and medical concepts, and both the differences between Descartes and Regius as well as Regius' debt to Descartes and vice versa. Moreover, this edition will, I hope, be useful to editors of future editions of Descartes' correspondence. Although every now and then autograph letters resurface, the works by the 17th-century editor Clerselier, his successors, and Baillet are still a major source for the correspondence of Descartes. A profound study into their work remains a desideratum, but it is my wish that my efforts in this respect on the correspondence between Descartes and Regius will prove to be of some value.

¹⁷ ESZE 1973.

¹⁸ Cf. VERBEEK 1994; VERBEEK 1999. In 1966 Micheli published an Italian translation of several of Descartes' letters to Regius, proposing new dates in view of Regius' *Physiologia* I-III. His achievement, however, went completely unnoticed until Bordoli's translation of the correspondence of Descartes and Regius in 1997. For a review of Bordoli's edition, see BOS 2001.

¹⁹ In most cases by using Regius' *Physiologia*, which text I therefore appended to this edition.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CORRESPONDENCE

1. HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

The history of the correspondence between Descartes and Regius is marked by misfortune. None of the original letters — the letters actually sent — survived the tempest of time. With two exceptions, all manuscript drafts and copies perished as well. The vast amount of manuscripts, which after Descartes' death came into possession of the editor of Descartes' correspondence, Claude Clerselier (1614–1684), and the material collected by him and his successors, were irretrievably lost at the beginning of the 18th century.¹ This collection contained copies of Regius' letters to Descartes and drafts of Descartes' letters to Regius. Fortunately, Clerselier did not hesitate to publish the latter in the first volume of Descartes' letters published in 1657. Regius, however, did not permit Clerselier to print his side of the correspondence, and never gave up Descartes' original letters, leaving Clerselier unable to check his version against the letters actually sent. After Regius' death, Descartes' original letters vanished without a trace. All that remains in manuscript of the correspondence between Descartes and Regius is an early 18th-century copy of two short letters of Descartes to Regius. These letters, not published by Clerselier, were rediscovered in Debrecen, Hungary; a Hungarian student of theology on peregrination along the Dutch universities copied them in his notebook.

Except for the two manuscript copies in Debrecen, we have at our disposal printed drafts of Descartes' letters to Regius, but by far not all of them, published by Clerselier. For Regius' side of the correspondence we have to rely on Baillet's biography of Descartes, published in 1691 (*Vie*).

1.1. *Descartes' letters to Regius*

1.1.1. *Descartes' legacy in Stockholm*

The day after Descartes' funeral in Stockholm, that is on 13 February 1650, the French ambassador in Sweden, Pierre Chanut (1601–1662), made an official inventory of the philosopher's possessions.² Family papers, books and a duplicate of the inventory were sent to Descartes' relatives in France, his wardrobe was given to his inconsolable valet.

¹ For biographical data on Clerselier, see DBF, VIII, 1524, which, however, contains two inaccuracies. First, according to DBF Clerselier's sister Cathérine (c.1599–1670) married Adrien Chanut, but the notice does not mention that Pierre Chanut married another sister of Clerselier, Marguerite, in 1626 (cf. the entry on Pierre Chanut in DBF, VII, 403–403). Second, Clerselier is not the author of the Objections appended to Descartes' *Meditationes de prima philosophiae* (Paris 1641; Amsterdam 1642), but the translator of the Objections and Responses for the French edition (Paris 1647). Clerselier, who corresponded with Descartes and met him on several occasions, devoted the last 30 years of his life to editing the philosopher's posthumous works. For his defense of Cartesianism, see BALZ 1930.

² On Chanut, see DBF, VII, 402–403; RAYMOND 1999. Baillet's *Vie* is our main source of the actions

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

Chanut himself took care of Descartes' scientific manuscripts.³ His initial plan to publish Descartes' correspondence on the sovereign good with Queen Christina of Sweden and Princess Elizabeth failed to materialise, because Elizabeth refused Chanut her letters to the French philosopher.⁴ Diplomatic affairs prevented Chanut from investigating the manuscripts properly. Only after his arrival in the Netherlands in November 1653, where he was appointed ambassador, he found the leisure to inspect Descartes' legacy more closely, undoubtedly stimulated by Descartes' friend, the statesman and poet Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687). Chanut compiled, possibly with the help of Huygens' son Christiaan, an inventory of the manuscripts found in Stockholm.⁵ According to Huygens and others, the ambassador intended to publish a selection of the correspondence.⁶ However, in 1654 Chanut sent the material to his brother-in-law Claude Clerselier in Paris. Clerselier immediately began preparing the publication, not of a selection of the correspondence, but of all of Descartes' letters found in Stockholm.⁷ His editorial labor resulted in a three volume work, published in 1657, 1659 and 1667.

1.1.2. The first dispute between Clerselier and Regius

In the first volume of *Lettres de Mr Descartes* (Paris 1657), Clerselier included 18 'letters' of Descartes to the Utrecht professor of medicine Henricus Regius. Of course, the

taken in Stockholm immediately after Descartes' death (*Vie*, II, 427–428), from which Adam and Tannery distil an account of the so-called Stockholm inventory and the history of Descartes' manuscripts that has become *communis opinio* (see AT I XV–XIX and AT X 1–4). Recent research has shown that this standard view on Descartes' manuscripts left in Sweden and Holland (on the 'Leiden inventory', cf. *Vie*, II, 386, 428–429/AT V 409–410) needs revision on several important points. In the present paragraph I summarise some of the results which Theo Verbeek and I will lay down in a forthcoming article on the Leiden and Stockholm inventories. Dibon raises some important points concerning the Stockholm manuscripts in his 'Clerselier, éditeur de la correspondance de Descartes' (DIBON 1990, 495–521).

- 3 'Le lendemain se fit la visite du coffre, des papiers et des écrits du défunt. Le peu de livres qui s'étoient trouvez par l'Inventaire de la veille, et les papiers concernant les affaires domestiques, furent mis à l'écart, pour être rendus à ses héritiers. Mais pour les écrits concernant les sciences, M. l'Ambassadeur les prit sous sa protection particulière. Il les repassa à son plaisir', *Vie*, II, 428.
- 4 Cf. Chanut to Elizabeth, 19 February 1650, and 16 April 1650, in AT V 471, 472–473. Elizabeth's refusal is reported in *Vie*, II, 428 (AT V 474–475).
- 5 'Monsieur Chanut, qui possède tous les papiers du defunct, et pretend d'en faire imprimer quelques lettres d'eslite, desire feuilleter le tout avecq mondit Archimede [Christiaan Huygens], pour veoir ce qu'il y a encor de philosophique ou de mathematique dont on pourroit faire part au public, n'(y) ayant point de brouillon de ceste merveilleuse main, à mon advis, qui ne le merite', Huygens to Elizabeth, 31 December 1653, HUYGENS 1911–1917, 194/AT X 3. Christiaan's assistance may explain the presence of a copy of the inventory in the Huygens-collection in Leiden University Library. A second copy, which belonged to Clerselier, is kept in Bibliothèque nationale de France (cf. AT X 1–4). For Constantijn Huygens, see NNBW, I, 1186–1190. His correspondence is published by Worp (HUYGENS 1911–1917); the rediscovered correspondence with Descartes is edited by Roth in 1926 (ROTH 1926). A selection of his poems, with biographical introduction and references to further literature, is edited by Davidson and Van der Weel (HUYGENS 1996). On Christiaan Huygens (1629–1695), see NNBW, I, 1180–1186, and his recent biography ANDRIESSE 1993.
- 6 See the correspondence of January 1654 between the Pensionary of Holland Johan de Witt (1625–1672) and Andreas Colvius (1594–1671), minister of the Walloon Church at Dordrecht, published in THUISSENSCHOUTE 1953, and analysed in DIBON 1990, 510–511.
- 7 On Clerselier's edition, see below, § 2.1.

Introduction

original letters were in Regius' possession, so the material Clerselier actually published consisted of drafts of Descartes' letters to Regius. Some of them, Clerselier admitted, were imperfect. To one letter, which breaks off abruptly after Descartes' announcement that he is going to expound his view on fever, the editor places the comment:

Deest reliquum. Et si candidè et generosè⁸ D. Regius velit agere, illud supplebit.⁹

In his preface to the first volume Clerselier gives ample introduction to the Cartesian apostate Regius:

Je croy qu'il est de l'honneur de Monsieur Descartes, de faire remarquer aux Lecteurs la familiarité et correspondance des lettres qu'il a eu avec Monsieur le Roy, Professeur en Medecin en l'Université d'Utrecht [sic], afin que tout le monde sçache avec quelle franchise il luy communiquoit ses pensées.¹⁰

In the pages that follow, Clerselier contrasts Descartes' 'frankness' with Regius' disloyalty. While Descartes amicably and generously shared his thoughts, views and comments, Regius published them under his own name. Clerselier refers to Regius' *Fundamenta physices*, published in 1646, which book Descartes publicly denounced in the preface to the French translation of his *Principia* (Paris 1647).¹¹ Descartes accused the Utrecht professor of plagiarism: Regius would have taken most of his ideas on physics and medicine both from Descartes' published works and from an unpublished manuscript, now known as *Traité de l'Homme*. In his preface Clerselier reiterates the accusation of plagiarism, which he considers to be even more blameworthy because Regius' tribute to Descartes in the preliminaries of *Fundamenta physices*, acknowledging his debt to the French philosopher, disappeared in the second edition of the work (*Philosophia naturalis*, 1654). For which Clerselier reproaches Regius:

Il me permettra, s'il luy plaist, de luy dire, qu'il auroit encore plus genereusement fait, si nonobstant le des-aveu que Monsieur Descartes a fait de ses écrits, il n'avoit pas laissé de rendre à sa memoire toute la reconnoissance qu'il luy doit, et d'avouër publiquement qu'il n'a presque rien mis de bon dans son livre, qu'il n'ait appris de luy, soit par ses lettres, soit par ses conferences, soit par ses avis, soit enfin par ses écrits, tant ceux qu'il avoit dé-jà publiez, que ceux qui luy estoient tombez entre les

⁸ Allusion to Regius' device to his portrait in *Philosophia naturalis* (REGIUS 1654): *Candide et Generose*.

⁹ See D/R 24.

¹⁰ *Lettres de Mr Descartes*, I, Preface, AT V 753.

¹¹ See AT IXB 19–20.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

mains, dont i'espere dans peu faire part au public;¹² ce que les lettres que l'on verra icy estre adressées iustificeront en partie.¹³

Finally, Clerselier exhorts Regius to recognise his mistake and to show the courage to acknowledge his debt to Descartes in a third edition of his work. The Utrecht professor should furthermore shrug off his errant conceptions in metaphysics and replace them with orthodox Cartesianism. In order to disclose the nature of Regius' errors in metaphysics to the French public, Clerselier translated Descartes' *Notae in programma quoddam* (Amsterdam 1648), and printed it behind the letters to Regius in his *Lettres de Mr Descartes*.

Regius responded quickly by reissuing in the same year his *Brevis explicatio mentis humanae*, which had first appeared in 1648 in reply to Descartes' *Notae*. In the preface of the second edition, a certain Carolus Fabricius — of whom we know nothing and who may be Regius himself — stood up for Regius. According to Fabricius, the sole purpose of Clerselier's publication of Descartes' confidential letters to Regius is to blacken Regius' name. Letters edited with this goal are nothing but lies, they are made-up and fictitious.¹⁴ Descartes' ill-treatment of Regius in his *Notae* rules out, so Fabricius claims, that the latter could repeat his laudations in the second edition of his physics. Further, Regius never saw the unpublished work of Descartes; by contrast, Fabricius suggests that Descartes copied material from Regius' physiology, which the Utrecht professor shared with his French friend many years before its publication in 1646.¹⁵ Finally, as regards Regius' 'erroneous' opinions on God and the human soul, the fact that Descartes remained silent after the publication of *Brevis explicatio* proves that he acknowledged he was wrong. The ultimate proof of this, Fabricius concludes, is the fact that after his move to Sweden in 1649 the philosopher publicly expressed his favourable opinion of Regius.¹⁶

12 Clerselier aims at *Le Monde*, and *L'Homme*. Chanut did not send all manuscripts at once. In 1654 Clerselier wrote two letters to the Groningen professor of Greek Tobias Andreae (1604–1676), which reveal that he had not yet received all of the items listed in the inventory. Moreover, Clerselier asks Andreae for a copy of *L'Homme*, which he does not possess. The work is not mentioned in the inventory either. This renders Clerselier's claim in the preface to his edition of *L'Homme* (Paris 1664) that it is founded upon Descartes' autograph suspect, something which Adam fails to notice (cf. AT XI II, VI). Clerselier also requests Andreae to send him any copies of Descartes' correspondence. Clerselier's first letter is published in AT X 13–14, without addressee or date. Dibon established both elements from an autograph letter of Clerselier to Andreae of 12 July 1654 (DIBON 1990, 495–521).

13 *Lettres de Mr Descartes*, I, Preface, AT V 754.

14 'Adhaec ipsae illae literae, ita editae, per se nullam fidem merentur; sed pro mere ementitis, et ex post facto fictis, sunt habendae. Tantum abest, ut illae Regio quicquam obesse queant', REGIUS 1657, 6.

15 See my commentary on R/D 12, *Context*.

16 Two letters by Robert Creighton (1593–1672), from Stockholm, to Regius give evidence of this. Both letters, dated 20 April and 12 June 1651, are appended to the second edition of *Brevis explicatio*. The relevant passage in the first letter is: '... fama celebritatis tuae penetravit, sparsa per tuum Cartesium, de te saepe, tuisque editis loquentem inter suos, ut nuper didici. Putabantque populares, aliique, ad quos

Introduction

The reply, rather surprisingly, did not discourage Clerselier in writing to the Utrecht professor with an appeal for help in 1659. He was looking for assistance in drawing the figures for *Le Monde* and *L'Homme*. He offered to send Regius both treatises, but Regius declined.¹⁷ The Utrecht professor replied that he had never seen the works and that he had no desire to see them now.¹⁸ Moreover, he doubted the authenticity of those works because Descartes had not published them himself; Regius reminds Clerselier of the philosopher's warning that nothing should be attributed to him which he had not published himself.¹⁹ Which dictum applies to the so-called letters to him as well, Regius implies.

In their dispute Clerselier and Regius do not consider one obvious question: Descartes' original letters to Regius. Apparently, Clerselier never formally asked the Utrecht professor for (copies of) the original letters, and, less surprisingly but equally significantly, we have no evidence that Regius refused them to the editor of Descartes' correspondence. The latter did insert a request in the first volume (*Et si candidè et generosè D. Regius velit agere, illud supplebit*), but one can hardly consider this to be a serious attempt to persuade Regius. As if Regius would generously supply the autographs after publicly receiving the stigma of an unfaithful friend, a Cartesian apostate and a plagiarist. In my view, the harsh attitude in the preface may be partly explained by assuming that Clerselier wrote to Regius before publication of the first volume, per-

ejus sermones pervenerunt, te virum esse eximium et illustrem, quem ille tantus vir toties commemoraret', REGIUS 1657, 34. Creighton's source is Pierre Chanut. The letters give evidence that Creighton lived in Utrecht for some time in the late 1640s, where he befriended Regius and his family as well as Antonius Æmilius (on Æmilius, see the *Biographical Lexicon*). Creighton returned to Utrecht in 1652 and stayed there for four years as the tutor of an English nobleman's son (BROCKBANK 1959; VERNEY 1970). In 1655, the Senate of Utrecht University allowed him to give private lectures in Greek (*Acta*, 302). For Creighton, who became bishop of Bath and Wells in 1670, see DNB, 13, 69–70. Regius' English contacts will have arranged the permission to dedicate the third edition of *Philosophia naturalis* (REGIUS 1661B) to Charles II (1660–1685) and Regius' elevation to the knighthood in 1661 (cf. DE VRIJER 1917, 17). On the English community in Utrecht, and Regius' dealings with some of them, see Keblusek's study *The Exile Experience. Book Culture and Intellectual Contacts of Royalists and Anglicans in Exile on the Continent (1642–1660)*, Leiden/New York: E.J. Brill (forthcoming).

17 In 1659 Clerselier and Regius exchanged four letters: Clerselier to Regius, 25 April; Regius to Clerselier, 25 September; Clerselier to Regius, September (?), and finally, Regius to Clerselier, 9/19 October. Clerselier summarises his first letter in the preface to his edition of *L'Homme*: 'Je le priois de se vouloir donner la peine de travailler aux Figures qui manquoient à son [Descartes'] *Traité de l'Homme*: tant parce que l'examen qu'il seroit obligé de faire des deux *Traitez* que je luy enverrois, pourroit luy ouvrir l'esprit pour découvrir la verité qu'il recherche avec tant de soin, et luy donner de belles lumieres pour avancer dans le grand ouvrage de l'Homme, auquel on ne sçauroit trop travailler; que parce que c'estoit un moyen de faire revivre et rendre publique l'ancienne amitié qui avoit autrefois esté entre M. Descartes et luy ...', AT XI XIV–XV. Regius published his last letter in 1661 (REGIUS 1661A), in which he mentions the dates of the first two letters, without indicating the date of Clerselier's second letter. REGIUS 1661A is preceded by some introductory remarks by Carolus Fabricius.

18 In reality, Descartes had sent Regius a copy of *Le Monde* in 1641 (cf. D/R 19B, ll. 75–79). Shortly before *Fundamenta physices* appeared, Regius got hold of a copy of *L'Homme* as well, at least according to Descartes (see D/R 13, n. 27).

19 REGIUS 1661A, 38: 'Posteris hic oratos volo ut nunquam credant, quidquam à me esse profectum, quod ipse in lucem non edidero' (*Dissertatio de methodo*, AT VI 579).

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

suading him to place the original letters — and perhaps a copy of *L'Homme* as well — at his disposal, to which Regius had replied negatively that he had no knowledge of that work and felt no need to supply his correspondence, which after all was confidential.

1.1.3. The letters sent to Regius

The fate of Descartes' original letters to Regius is unknown. In his will of 26 December 1678 Regius left his manuscripts to his former student Petrus Wassenæer, but there is no mention of letters or papers in any of the subsequent wills.²⁰ The letters never resurfaced and it is not inconceivable that Regius destroyed them. The two original items which were copied by a Hungarian student (see § 2.4), have not been rediscovered. The fact that the student copied exactly these two insignificant letters (D/R 34 and D/R 35) and not letters of a more substantial nature, strongly suggests that they were separated from the collection at an earlier stage. Perhaps Regius gave them away to satisfy the curiosity of a friend.

1.2. Regius' letters to Descartes

1.2.1. The second dispute between Clerselier and Regius

A first trace of Regius' letters is found in Clerselier's preface to his edition of *L'Homme* (Paris 1664). After the account of his unsuccessful request to Regius to collaborate on the edition of *L'Homme* (see above), Clerselier turns to Regius' letters to Descartes, which he would like to have published in the second edition of the first volume of Descartes' correspondence:

Toutesfois, pour dire les choses comme elles sont, je croy que Monsieur le Roy ne me desavoüera pas, quand je diray de luy, qu'il a fait autrefois l'honneur à Monsieur Descartes de le consulter souvent sur des questions de Physique et de Medecine, et en general de Philosophie, et qu'ainsi il l'a autrefois consideré comme une personne de qui il pouvoit apprendre. Et quand il ne le voudroit pas avoüer, cela se justifie assez par les lettres de M. Descartes, et par celles que luy-mesme luy a autrefois écrites, dont j'ay de fideles copies, tirées sur l'original, lesquelles sont pleines de ces questions. J'avois eu la pensée de les faire imprimer dans la seconde Edition qui s'est faite l'année dernière du premier volume des Lettres de Monsieur Descartes,²¹ afin de justifier par les missives de Monsieur le Roy, que les lettres de Monsieur Descartes, qui leur servent de réponse, ne sont point des choses controuvées et faites à plaisir, comme cet amy de Monsieur le Roy, dont j'ay déjà parlé, semble vouloir insinuer;²² mais

²⁰ Wolfard Zwaardcroon de Jonge, notary public, drew up no less than 9 different wills and codicils between 26 December 1678 and 15 February 1679, which are kept in GAU, *Notariële archieven*, inv. no. U 80 A 5 (cf. DE VRIJER 1917, 75, 87). For Petrus van Wassenæer, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

²¹ In 1663 Clerselier published a second edition of the first volume of Descartes' correspondence, unaltered except for Descartes' letters to Regius, which Clerselier rearranged (see § 2.1.5).

²² Carolus Fabricius.

Introduction

en ayant écrit à Monsieur le Roy, pour ne rien faire que de concert avec luy, il ne l'a pas voulu permettre;²³ Quoy que toutes ces lettres soient si pleines de civilité, d'estime et de respect pour luy et pour sa doctrine, et font voir tant d'amitié et de correspondance entre l'un et l'autre, que je ne puis deviner ce qui peut empescher Monsieur le Roy d'en permettre la publication.²⁴

Clerselier claims he possesses exact copies of Regius' letters to Descartes, made after the original. A note in the so-called *Exemplaire de l'Institut* confirms Clerselier's claim that he had the letters at his disposal.²⁵ The note refers to letter no. 32 in the collection of Regius' letters to Descartes (R/D 55, [13/] 23 June 1645):

Voyez la 32e lettre des Ms de Regius a D(escartes), datée du 23 juin 1645, où on lit ces paroles: *Hesterno mane fasciculum tuarum chartarum accepi, etc.*, et dans une note marginale, M. Clerselier a mis ces paroles: *Fasciculus ille est eius defensio contra Voetium.*²⁶

According to this note, Clerselier placed a remark in the margin of Regius' letter no. 32. This indicates that Clerselier indeed possessed Regius' letters to Descartes, or to be more precise, 'fideles copies, tirées sur l'original'.

The provenance of these copies is not clear. There are, basically, two possibilities. The simplest explanation is that Clerselier uncovered them among the Stockholm manuscripts. But it is not easy to understand why Descartes would take copies with him to Sweden, and not the autographs. The second possibility is that he received them from someone in the Netherlands. We know that he made a request for copies of Descartes' correspondence to the Groningen professor Tobias Andreae.²⁷ After Descartes' death, Regius' original letters will have been found in the trunk the philosopher left with Cornelis van Hogelande.²⁸ Not much is known on the fate of the letters discovered, but we do know that Huygens' letters were restituted to him by Van Hogelande.²⁹ In the case of Regius, it is conceivable that this was not done, or only after copies were made, because of the break in 1645 and subsequent animosity between Descartes and Regius. Before leaving for Sweden, Descartes asked Van Hogelande not to destroy Voetius' letters to Marin Mersenne (1588–1648), as a safeguard against the calumnies

²³ Regius' letter to Clerselier, dated 19 February 1663 (NS?), is mentioned by Baillet: '... la défense que M. Regius fit à M. Clerselier d'imprimer ses lettres à M. Descartes, et par le mépris qu'il affecta de faire paroître pour ses ouvrages postumes. *In margine*: Lettr. Ms. de Reg. à Clers. du 19 Octob. 1659. et du 19 Févr. 1663' (*Vie*, II, 292).

²⁴ AT XI xv–xvi (emphasis added).

²⁵ The *Exemplaire de l'Institut* is a copy of Clerselier's three volume edition of Descartes' correspondence with numerous additional notes in handwriting (see § 2.3).

²⁶ R/D 55A.

²⁷ See n. 12.

²⁸ For Van Hogelande, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

²⁹ Cf. ROTH 1926, XXXV.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

of the Utrecht theologian.³⁰ Perhaps Descartes' friends made the same exception for the letters of the Utrecht professor of medicine.

1.2.2. After Clerselier: Legrand, Baillet and Marmion

After his publication of Descartes' correspondence, *L'Homme* and *Description du corps humain*, and *Le Monde* (Paris 1677), Clerselier considered the publication of one last volume with the remaining items from Descartes' manuscripts.³¹ In 1683, he finally made preparations for the publication of the volume in Amsterdam, but his death on April 13 of the next year prevented this completion of his life's work.³² In his will he bestowed the manuscripts and a handsome sum of money to realise the project to Jean-Baptiste Legrand.³³ Legrand, however, had the more ambitious plan to produce a completely new edition of Descartes' correspondence.

The accessibility of approximately 80 autograph letters of Descartes to Mersenne triggered the idea for a new project. Clerselier had published the drafts of most of these letters, but the mathematician Gilles de Roberval (1602–1675), who possessed the original letters, had never allowed him to use the collection.³⁴ After Roberval's death, the letters became available at last. Legrand saw it as his first task to publish them in a new edition of the correspondence.³⁵ Perhaps the confrontation between the original letters and Clerselier's edition, which revealed much of the latter's defects, inspired

30 'Je ne sçache point [...] qu'il y ait rien de secret dans aucune de ces lettres que j'ay laissées dans le coffre. Mais néanmoins, de peur qu'il ne s'y trouve quelques choses que ceux qui les ont écrites ne voudroient pas être luës de tout le monde, je crois que le plus sûr est de les brûler toutes, excepté celles de Voetius au Père de Mersenne, que vous trouverez insérées dans le couvercle du coffre, et que je desire être gardées pour servir de préservatif contre ses calomnies. Vous pourrez aussi lire toutes les autres, ou les laisser lire par quelques amis discrets, avant de les brûler, et même ne brûler que celles que vous voudrez; car je remets entièrement cela à votre discrétion', Descartes to Van Hogelande, 30 August 1649, AT V 410.

31 'Il ne m'en reste plus entre les mains que dequoy faire un Volume de Fragmens, qui sera un ramas de diverses pieces, dont le triage est assez mal-aisé à faire, et dont ie me déchargeray volontiers sur le premier qui voudra bien en prendre la peine (...) ou, s'il ne se presente personne, qu'on attende avec patience ma commodité', preface to the third volume of Descartes' correspondence (1667), AT V 779. In 1677 Clerselier issued his version of *Le Monde*, which work had already been published in Paris in 1664 but not from the manuscript in his possession (cf. AT XI I–VII).

32 '... D. Clerselier in animo esse edere omnia opera posthuma, quaeque adhuc supersunt, D. R. des Cartes, et propterea pactum iniisse cum Mr Boom typographo hic loci, qui ea latine et gallice brevi edet', Pieter van Gent (1640–1693/4), from Amsterdam, to Ehrenfried Walther von Tschirnhaus (1651–1709), Kieslingswalde, 16 October 1683, in REINHARDT 1911, 18. For the context of the letter, see BOS 1999C.

33 The sparse biographical information on Legrand is found in Baillet's preface to his *Vie* and an announcement in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* cited below.

34 Alan Gabbey, who kindly sent me his unpublished work on Roberval's legacy, suggests that Mersenne lent the letters to Roberval, who kept them after the Minim died. Gabbey's suggestion is by far more plausible than Clerselier's and Baillet's accusation that Roberval stole the letters after Mersenne's death, and is to be preferred to the view of Adam and Tannery as well, who maintain that Roberval was Mersenne's literary executor.

35 The letters came into possession of Philippe de la Hire (1640–1718), professor at the Collège de France and member of the Academie des Sciences (DBF, 19, 329). La Hire communicated the letters to Legrand and Baillet, but they never became part of Legrand's collection of manuscripts. A note, presumably in Legrand's hand, on one of the letters bears the year 1684, which shows that the *abbé* began his editorial

Introduction

Legrand to track as many letters as possible.³⁶ Needless to say that this slowed the work down considerably. In 1690 Legrand gave a concerned correspondent the following reassuring reply:

Je vous diray pour votre consolation, Monsieur, que tous les manuscrits de Mr Descartes qui n'ont point encore été imprimez sont en ma possession, outre 120 lettres que j'ay recueillies de diverses personnes.³⁷

In the preface to his biography of Descartes Baillet relates Legrand's efforts and, moreover, which letters he recovered:

Il a pris la peine d'écrire en Bretagne, en Touraine, en Languedoc, en Hollande, en Suède, et en Allemagne pour intéresser les parens, les alliez, et les amis du Philosophe dans ce dessein. Il a recouvré non seulement *les lettres manuscrites de M. Regius Professeur d'Utrecht à M. Descartes*; mais encore la plupart de celles de M. Descartes à M. l'Abbé Picot, à M. Clerselier, au sieur Tobie d'André, et à d'autres; celles de M. le Chevalier de Terlon Ambassadeur de France en Suède; quelques unes de celles de la Princesse Palatine Elizabeth de Bohême, de M. Chanut Ambassadeur de France en Suède, et de divers Particuliers.³⁸

Among many other letters, Legrand was able to lay his hands on Regius' letters to Descartes. But by 1663, Clerselier already possessed copies of these letters, and the note in the *Exemplaire de l'Institut* shows that Clerselier's successors had the same collection at their disposal. What, then, does Baillet mean by saying that Legrand retrieved Regius' letters? The key to the answer is found in the quotation from Baillet's preface. According to the biographer, Legrand had obtained Descartes' letters to Clerselier as well. It is unthinkable that Clerselier did not possess these letters, but yet Legrand did not discover them among the collection of manuscripts that was passed on to him. This means that Legrand did not receive all manuscripts formerly in the possession of Clerselier, which may be due to the originally modest objective of Legrand, namely

labor immediately after Clerselier's death (cf. AT III 319). For the La Hire collection and its much troubled history, see AT I LI–LXI, LXIV–LXVI, AT II V–XVII.

³⁶ The shortcomings of Clerselier's edition are discussed below (§ 2.1.3).

³⁷ Legrand to Chouet in Geneva, 10 April 1690; cited from AT I XLVIII. Regrettably, Adam does not mention the letter's context nor its location. The correspondent is Jean-Robert Chouet (1642–1731) who introduced Cartesianism in the Academy of Geneva (HEYD 1982).

³⁸ *Vie*, I, XXII (emphasis added). Baillet heavily profited from the correspondence unearthed by Legrand. Next to 37 letters by Regius' and Æmilius, his biography records 29 letters by Descartes to Picot, 7 letters to Clerselier, 5 letters to Andreae; "à d'autres" probably concern 7 letters to the Descartes-family, 2 letters to Van Hogelande, one letter to Servien, and 2 letters to and from Villebressieu. The letters by Hugues de Terlon (c.1620–c.1690), on the transfer of Descartes' body to France, date from the years 1665–1667 (12 letters). The letters by Princess Elizabeth are letters to Chanut. Except for the latter's return letters, Baillet refers in his biography to 8 letters from Chanut to Descartes. Legrand is responsible for the resurfacing of Regius' letters, the letters to Picot, Clerselier and Andreae. The other letters are partly retrieved by Baillet as well (cf. *Vie*, I, XXIII–XXVI).

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

to publish only Descartes' unpublished works. Aiming at a revised edition of the correspondence, Legrand requested and received from Clerselier's heirs the unpublished letters to Clerselier and Regius' letters to Descartes.³⁹

We may now discuss the last chapter in the history of Regius' letters to Descartes. Baillet, to whom Legrand had given the manuscripts for his biography of Descartes, made extensive use of Regius' letters, referring to them on numerous occasions and sometimes providing large quotations. Baillet suggests that Legrand indeed intended to publish them in the new edition of Descartes' correspondence.⁴⁰ But despite Legrand's many years of editorial labor, he never managed to send anything to the publisher. After his death in 1704, the manuscripts and the money went to his appointed successor, a certain Marmion, professor of philosophy at the Collège de Grassins in Paris.⁴¹ An unfortunate choice, for Marmion died the next year without appointing a successor. The manuscripts were given to Legrand's mother, and they have been lost ever since.

2. DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE SOURCES

2.1. *Lettres de Mr Descartes, edited by Claude Clerselier (vol. I, 1657)*

In 1657 Clerselier published the first volume of Descartes' correspondence, with the title *Lettres de Mr Descartes où sont traitées les plus belles questions de la Morale, Physique, Medecine et des Mathematiques*.⁴² The preliminary part of the quarto volume consists of a preface by Clerselier (22 pages, not paginated⁴³), two pages with the inscriptions on Descartes' monument in Stockholm, a table of contents and an extract of the royal privilege, dated 21 December 1656.⁴⁴ The body of the work contains 119 numbered items (pages 1–663; errata on p. [664]). Next to 105 letters by Descartes, Clerselier included 11 letters to Descartes, his own correspondence with the English philosopher Henry More (2 letters), and a French translation of Descartes' *Notae in programma quoddam*. The heart of the volume is formed by Descartes' 31 letters to Princess Elizabeth. Quantitatively, the letters to Regius are second best with 18 items listed (nos. 81–98, pp. 474–535), followed by the 12 letters to Chanut. Other

³⁹ The same may hold true for the letters to Andreae.

⁴⁰ 'Sa lettre [R/D 3] est datée du IX de Mars 1639 et ne pouvant y renvoyer le Lecteur, parce qu'elle n'est pas encore publique, il est à propos de lui en représenter le sens en abrégé pour des raisons dont ont lui laissera ensuite l'examen', *Vie*, II, 8.

⁴¹ The only source on the (mis)fortune of the manuscripts and their owners after 1691 is an announcement in *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* of June 1705, 697–699 (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1966, vol. 7, 180).

⁴² For a complete bibliographical analysis of the work, I refer to the new and exhaustive bibliography of Descartes' works (1637–1704) by Van Otegem (VAN OTEGEM 2002).

⁴³ The preface is reprinted in AT V 747–755. In my references to Clerselier's preface below I refer to the text in AT.

⁴⁴ *Achévé d'imprimer pour la première fois le 30 Janvier 1657* (beneath the privilege).

Introduction

addressees, among whom Mersenne, Balzac and Clerselier himself, have a maximum of 4 letters. Correspondences having letters from both sides are those with More, the French mathematician Jean-Baptiste Morin, the Jesuit Ciermans, the Dutch physician Van Beverwijck and the Leuven professor of medicine Plemp. Almost half of the volume, nos. 1–51 consists of letters to royalty and diplomats (Princess Elizabeth, Queen Christina of Sweden, Chanut, etc.), which letters are arranged more or less thematically, for example, letters in which Descartes discusses his move to Sweden. The correspondence in the remainder of the volume is classified per addressee.⁴⁵

Due to the variety of topics discussed in the correspondence the first volume found ready buyers, and in the preface of the second volume (Paris 1659) Clerselier proudly announced that the edition was completely sold out.⁴⁶ A second edition appeared in 1663, ‘reveu et augmenté’, a somewhat exaggerated statement, as the only additions are French translations of several Latin letters.⁴⁷ The most notable revision deals with the letters to Regius, the order of which Clerselier rearranged. The second edition is also in quarto, but counts only 540 pages, because the number of lines per page changed from 30 in the first edition to 36 in the second. A third edition, unaltered in lay-out and contents, appeared in 1667.⁴⁸

2.1.1. Sources

For the letters incorporated in the first volume, Clerselier drew on several sources, but he found the majority of the letters among the “Stockholm” manuscripts. The inventory of the papers found in Stockholm lists several items dealing with correspondence:

A. Un assemblage de plusieurs cahiers liez ensemble, au nombre de dix, escrits d’autre main que de celle de Mons^r Descartes, ou sont transcrites plusieurs lettres receües par Mons^r Descartes, avec les responses qu’il a faites, concernant des questions mathématiques, et quelques objections aux escrits de M^rDescartes.⁴⁹

I. Une liasse de plusieurs lettres et objections à Mons^r Desc, par diverses personnes.⁵⁰

⁴⁵ The sole exception are the letters to Mersenne, nos. 73 and 74, and nos. 101 and 102. In his introduction to Descartes’ correspondence, Adam offers an overview of all the letters in the first volume of Clerselier’s edition (AT I xx–xxi).

⁴⁶ AT V 756.

⁴⁷ Cf. AT I xix–xx.

⁴⁸ There are small differences between the three editions. Adam notices that the orthography varies in the different editions of Clerselier’s correspondence (AT I civ). Gabbey detected several variant readings in the correspondence with More (cf. AT V 668–677).

⁴⁹ AT X 5.

⁵⁰ AT X 10.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

T. Deux cents soixante deux feuillets in q^o des Minutes de lettres escrites par Mons^r des Cartes à diverses personnes.⁵¹

V. Quatorze feuillets in q^o et deux in 8^o de minutes de lettres escrites à Madame la princesse Elisabeth de Boheme.⁵²

Finally, there is an item in the inventory which seems, partly at least, to relate to correspondence:

Z. Une liasse d'environ 25 feuillets detachez sans suite, et quelques papiers volans, contenant la reponce à quelques objections et autres matieres differentes.⁵³

The inventory gives valuable information on the *kind* of letters found. It mentions, first, *minutes* or rough drafts (items T and V). Next, there were numerous, presumably original, letters to Descartes (item I). Item A is a collection of letters to Descartes with the philosopher's replies, all in the hand of a copyist, which may suggest that Descartes had prepared the collection for publication.⁵⁴

The Stockholm papers form the heart of Clerselier's publication of Descartes' correspondence. However, as the majority of the letters are rough drafts, sometimes in a deplorable state, Clerselier made use of other sources as well. Naturally, he possessed his own personal correspondence with the philosopher. From Morin and More he received copies of their epistolary exchange with Descartes.⁵⁵ Finally, Clerselier also drew on previously published correspondence. The exchange of letters with Plemp and Van Beverwijck were taken from the latter's *Epistolicae quaestiones*.⁵⁶

In sum, the various sources supplied different kinds of material:

1. rough drafts of letters sent by Descartes;
2. duplicates, of letters both sent and received;
3. original letters, by Descartes and to Descartes;
4. published letters.

The letters to Regius unmistakably fall in the first category; they are based on drafts contained in item T of the Stockholm inventory. Indeed, they were not previously

51 AT X 11.

52 AT X 12.

53 AT X 12. I ignore here Descartes' letter to the Utrecht Magistrates, the *Lettre apologétique*, of which a French version (item O) and a Latin version (item L) existed in the Stockholm inventory. Clerselier printed the French version in the third volume of the correspondence (AT VIII B 201–273). The Dutch translation, corrected and signed by Descartes, is published in DESCARTES 1996. Cf. BOS 1999B.

54 Possibly, item A comprised the objections and the replies to the *Discours*, which Descartes intended to incorporate in a second edition of the *Discours*. Cf. Descartes to Huygens, 29 January 1639, ROTH 1926, 87–88/AT II 675–676; to Huygens, 6 May 1639, ROTH 1926, 89–90/AT II 677–678).

55 Cf. CLE, I, Preface, AT V 751–752.

56 VAN BEVERWIJCK 1644. Cf. my commentary on R/D 11, n. 11.

Introduction

published and Clerselier did not have the original letters. As far as we know, Regius took no interest in mathematics, nor do his objections to Descartes' works seem to have impressed Descartes to the extent that he would have considered to publish them with his replies.⁵⁷ This rules out the possibility that Clerselier found the letters in the dossier listed A in the inventory.

2.1.2. Editorial problems

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Regius' spokesman Carolus Fabricius called the letters to Regius published by Clerselier 'fictitious and made up'. Clerselier seems to have anticipated remarks of a similar nature, but undoubtedly not as harsh as Fabricius'. In his preface he warns those who discover the letters they received from Descartes among the letters published in the volume, that the autographs may differ from the published texts. Clerselier gives two reasons.⁵⁸

First, the editor printed (the majority of) the letters after the manuscripts Descartes kept for himself. Transcribing the rough draft of a letter, Descartes may have changed something or made some corrections — as it often happens as Clerselier remarks — without adjusting the rough draft afterwards.

The second reason why a published letter may not be similar to the actual letter sent, is because the manuscripts used by Clerselier were in some places defective, or so badly written and chaotic, that he had to guess what the author actually meant. As a consequence, the editor was at times forced to supply words of his own and to fill in the occasional lacunas, which he did in accordance with 'la fidélité que ie luy dois'. Now, in the preface Clerselier states that he encountered these particular difficulties 'en quelques endroits', but in a letter to Andreae he is less restrictive:

... je vous diray que je travaille avec assiduité aux Lettres de Mr Descartes pour leur faire voir le jour dans peu de temps, mais comme je ne travaille que sur les brouillons qu'il se reservoit, qui sont pleines de ratures et d'omissions, et dont l'écriture est fort négligée comme est celle de la plupart de ceux qui ne travaillent que pour eux mesmes j'ay toutes les peynes du monde a déchiffrer ses lettres ...⁵⁹

The drafts — or indeed *rough* drafts, as Clerselier does not speak of *minutes* but refers to the papers as *brouillons* — were full of deletions and lacunas, and he had the greatest trouble in deciphering Descartes' handwriting. However, continuing his letter to Andreae, Clerselier makes two exceptions to the above:

⁵⁷ Descartes replies to several objections raised by Regius in D/R 15 and D/R 45.

⁵⁸ CLE, I, Preface, AT V 750–751.

⁵⁹ DIBON 1990, 499.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

... c'est pourquoy vous me feriez un singulier plaisir et vous rendriez un service au public de me vouloir faire le faveur de m'envoyer la copie des lettres que vous avez de luy qui vous sont adressées comme aussy celles ad H. More Anglum, et alios, car pour celles a Mad^e la Pr. Elisabeth, et a M^r Chanut je les ay assez bien escrites.⁶⁰

Next to asking Andreae for the letters he received from Descartes — which Andreae sent to him but which Clerselier did not publish⁶¹ — and for the letters to More — with which request Andreae was unable to comply as Clerselier later asked the letters directly from More — Clerselier reveals that he does not need Andreae's copies of the letters to Elizabeth and Chanut, as the material he possesses is clearly legible.

Returning to Clerselier's preface, the editor reveals that the difficulties just mentioned were in fact the least of his problems. According to Clerselier, the disarray of the manuscripts posed the greatest stumbling block. The letters were written on loose sheets of paper, often without mention of the addressee or the date; the sheets were not in their proper order, and in many cases without catchword and without recognisable beginning or end. As a result, Clerselier had to read everything before deciding which sheets belonged together and, if possible, conjecturing to whom they were addressed. Clerselier apologises for any mistakes he made in this respect, but he is well aware, or so he claims, that the majority of the public is not at all bothered by these questions, as long as Descartes' ideas are not distorted, and the presentation of the letters is made in an orderly fashion, to which matters complete attention has been given.

In his biography of Descartes, Baillet mentions the problems Clerselier encountered editing the correspondence, disclosing one additional complication. After paraphrasing the two points in Clerselier's preface, he continues:

Plusieurs questions qu'il [Descartes] avoit écrites en des lettres différentes et à des personnes différentes se trouvoient sur un même feuillet sans aucune marque des têmes et sans aucune spécification des faits historiques.⁶²

This particular difficulty is not mentioned by Clerselier, but as Baillet was able to consult the Stockholm collection of manuscripts, there is little doubt that Clerselier had to cope with this problem as well. Unfortunately, Baillet does not say how he solved the difficulty.

Finally, Baillet gives a remarkable explanation for the disarray of the Stockholm manuscripts Clerselier encountered. According to the biographer, Descartes' letters were already in a confused state when Chanut examined them, but an unlucky incident

⁶⁰ DIBON 1990, 499.

⁶¹ See n. 12.

⁶² *Vie*, II, 402.

Introduction

made the chaos complete.⁶³ The ship carrying Descartes' manuscripts from Holland to Paris sank in the river Seine. After three days the chest containing the philosopher's papers was recovered, and the manuscripts were rapidly hung out to dry, paying little attention to the original order of the manuscripts. Consequently, the gathering proved to be very difficult, and, moreover, some manuscripts had been damaged.

The volumes published by Clerselier do not show the amount of defects one would expect after all the troubles mentioned by Clerselier and Baillet. Clerselier did his best to iron out most of the defects. All one immediately notices, are the letters without addressee, the fact that most letters are not dated, and in some cases Clerselier's remark 'Deest reliquum'. Apart from these defects, the letters appear to be genuine letters, they have a salutation, and always end with the simple valediction 'Je suis, etc' or 'Vale'. In other words, Clerselier did not conceal the problems dealing with the addressee and the date of the letters, but he edited the texts painstakingly with respect to the condition of the texts and in deciding which sheets belonged together. These interventions are not indicated in his edition, and the Stockholm manuscripts having vanished, it is impossible to determine exactly what they were. But we are not completely left in the dark. The surfacing of autograph letters makes it possible in some cases to compare the original letters with the drafts published by Clerselier.

Adam and Tannery were able to replace a significant number of Clerselier's texts by the original letters. Placing the variants of Clerselier's text in the apparatus, a clear picture arises of the differences between the two versions. Roth was able to do the same in his publication of the Descartes–Huygens correspondence. One of the letters in the latter edition caused quite a stir. It is a letter of consolation to Huygens after the loss of his brother Maurits.⁶⁴ Roth remarked that between the original letter and the text printed by Clerselier, there is all the difference between a mildly agnostic view of immortality and the strict belief of theological dogmatism.⁶⁵ The differences are, according to Roth, due to Clerselier's meddling with the text, concealing any deviation from Roman Catholic doctrine. As a result, Roth advises to render suspect every reference to questions of religion contained in Clerselier's edition of the correspondence. Against the *real* Descartes, Roth opposes the Descartes of Clerselier.

Dibon, I think, has sufficiently shown the untenability of Roth's view.⁶⁶ He rightly points out that the vast majority of variants between Clerselier's texts and original letters

63 *Vie*, I, xxxii; II, 428. Baillet's account of the *nauffrage* is the only source of the incident.

64 Descartes to Huygens, 10 October 1642, CLE III, 625–626/AT III 578–580 (draft); ROTH 1926, 180–183/AT III 796–799 (autograph).

65 ROTH 1937, 104. Discussing the same letter, Adam wrote in his preface to Roth's edition (p. xvii): '[Clerselier] ajoute, il retranche, il change, et la pensée vraie du philosophe en est sensiblement altérée et déformée.'

66 DIBON 1990, 514–521. Cf. ARMOGATHE 1999, 8–14.

can be explained by the difference between the draft and the letter sent, which is indeed the first reason given by Clerselier himself. The other differences are to be attributed to the editor, but we should keep in mind the difficulties Clerselier encountered, and any solution he chose and any modification he made need to be seen in the perspective of 17th-century usage of editing correspondence.⁶⁷ Moreover, as the Stockholm manuscripts are lost, it is ultimately impossible to determine Clerselier's alterations. Dibon concludes that we need to suspend our judgement of Clerselier as deliberately falsifying Descartes' correspondence.

Dibon's assessment of Clerselier clears the way for a systematic study of Clerselier's edition of the correspondence. Given the loss of the Stockholm papers, the results of such a study will remain tentative. However, a profound study of Clerselier's texts on the one hand and original letters and other sources on the other can shed light on the liberties the editor took. It may reveal what kind of modifications he usually made. My observations below give an indication of the kind of results we may expect from a systematic study of Clerselier's three volume work.

2.1.3. Clerselier's interventions: an outline

The difficulties the Stockholm collection of manuscripts presented to Clerselier and which he sums up in his preface, boil down to four kinds of problems:

1. the addressees (not mentioned in the majority of the manuscripts);
2. the date (*idem*);
3. the establishment of the text (complicated by the defective state of the manuscripts, lacunas and Descartes' bad handwriting);
4. the reconstruction of a letter (deciding which sheets belong to one letter).

Before turning to the question how Clerselier dealt with these problems in the case of Descartes' letters to Regius, I shall first outline Clerselier's problem in solving these four points in general. Only the letters based upon drafts found among the Stockholm papers will be discussed, which exclude, in the first volume, Descartes' correspondence with More, Morin, Plemp, Van Beverwijck and the letters to Clerselier (25 letters in all). Because the results below are not founded on a systematic study of Clerselier's three volume edition of Descartes' correspondence — in fact, as regards the first two problems I only consider the first volume — the results remain provisional.

1. *Addressee*. As for the addressees, Clerselier writes in his preface:

... n'ayant pû à cette fois mettre à la teste de toutes les lettres les noms de ceux à qui elles sont adressées, faute de l'avoir trouvé dans le Manuscrit,

⁶⁷ Cf. Dibon's essay on the preparations for the first volume of the correspondence of I. Casaubon, published in *The Hague in 1638* (DIBON 1990, 221–266); ARMOGATHE 1999, 6–7.

Introduction

et pour ne l'avoir pû apprendre de personne, ny deviner par le stile, *lequel pourtant m'en a fait mettre quelques-uns par conjecture*. Et quand en cela ie me serois trompé, ie ne croy pas avoir fait tort à ceux de qui i'ay emprunté les noms.⁶⁸

Clerselier's claim that he did not know any of the addressees for certain is without doubt exaggerated, because in his letter to Andreae he knows which letters are addressed to Elizabeth and to Chanut. Indeed, the letters to Elizabeth will have posed no problem, since they formed a separate collection in the Stockholm papers. Such was not the case with the letters to Chanut, because Clerselier falsely attributes two letters to Chanut, whereas they were in fact sent to the French diplomat Brasset.⁶⁹ He also conjectured that three letters were written to Elizabeth's sister Louise, whereas they were directed to her youngest sister Sophie.⁷⁰ In the first volume 16 letters remained without addressee. These letters are said to be addressed 'A un Jésuite', or 'A un Père de l'Oratoire', or, when the addressee seems to be a secular person, 'A Monsieur ***'. Perhaps these designations are the result of thorough homework on the part of Clerselier, but it is not unthinkable that they reflect a pre-existing arrangement in the Stockholm papers, namely that a specific correspondence, for example with Jesuits or the letters to Chanut and Brasset, were collected together.

2. *Date*. In his preface Clerselier complains about the lack of any indication of date on the manuscripts.⁷¹ But despite this deficiency, the first volume has several sequences of letters which are chronologically correct.⁷² Careful reading of the manuscripts will have supplied Clerselier with clues, but the possibility that despite the disarray of the Stockholm papers some letters may still have been in their proper chronological order cannot be excluded.

3. *Establishment of the text*. Thanks to the editorial labour found in the *Exemplaire de l'Institut*, and the autograph letters rediscovered since, it is possible to compare Clerselier's texts and the texts of the letters actually sent. Do the differences inform us as to the manner in which Clerselier dealt with the defective state of the Stockholm manuscripts, the lacunas and Descartes' bad handwriting? Obviously not: as Dibon remarked, the vast majority of the differences can be accounted for by the difference between the draft and the final text of a letter. So either the material was not in such

68 AT V 751 (emphasis added).

69 Cf. AT V 331, 349.

70 Cf. AT IV 495.

71 Except for five letters to Chanut (nos. 35–38 and 43) and a letter to Mersenne (no. 74), the only letters which have a date in Clerselier's publication are those from Morin and the letters exchanged with Morin. Remarkably, Clerselier does not supply the dates of the letters Descartes wrote to him (nos. 117–119).

72 For example, the letters to Elizabeth, nos. 3 to 13 in Clerselier's edition, and the letters to Elizabeth, Chanut and others, nos. 42 to 50.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

a bad shape, or Clerselier successfully solved most difficulties. The truth is without a doubt somewhere in the middle.

Naturally, some cases remain in which we may have doubts about the authenticity of Clerselier's texts. Roth discussed the most extreme case. These doubts are fed by a remark of Clerselier himself that he softened several acrimonious expressions and suppressed the name of the person involved.⁷³ An example of a doubtful passage is found in a letter to Huygens. Descartes explains he is about to start a war with the Jesuits. He admits it may not be the wisest thing to do, and Clerselier's text continues:

Car, bien que ie sçache assez, il y a long-temps, qu'il ne fait bon s'attirer
des adversaires ...⁷⁴

Whereas the autograph letter reads:

car bien que ie sçache assez il y a long tems le proverbe *noli irritari
crabrones* ...⁷⁵

The difference between the rather bland turn in Clerselier's text when compared to the spicy saying in the autograph, is striking. But it is impossible to determine whether or not we are looking at an alteration of Clerselier's. The possibility that Descartes deviated from his draft version when he copied out the text cannot be excluded. Possibly, a systematic study of Clerselier's edition may reveal a pattern in cases like these.

A closer analysis of Clerselier's edition should pay attention to another kind of alterations by Clerselier which we have not yet discussed, namely additions which the editor inserted for what he believed to be the benefit of the reader. A good example of this practice are his additions to the text in some of the cases in which Descartes refers to one of his own works. In those cases Clerselier gives a page number when Descartes does not (or at least not in his autograph letters). Moreover, in some cases Clerselier supplies the page number of a French translation if Descartes referred to a Latin edition. Sometimes Clerselier adds the indication 'de la version française', an obvious addition by Clerselier if at the time the letter was written, no such translation existed.⁷⁶

In his preface Clerselier informs his reader that many drafts had no recognisable beginning or end. Virtually all letters in his edition, however, have a salutation and a simple valediction like 'Je suis, etc.' or 'Vale', which raises the suspicion that some were added by Clerselier. In one case it is certain that the salutation was added by Clerselier:

⁷³ CLE II, preface, AT V 763. Cf. *Vie*, II, 402.

⁷⁴ Descartes to Huygens, 31 July 1640, CLE III 593/AT III 103.

⁷⁵ ROTH 1926, 136/AT III 752. The proverb is Plautus', *Amphitruo* II, 2, 707.

⁷⁶ Additions like these are found in D/R 31, l. 12; AT III 397–398ff, 427, 666; AT V 186.

Introduction

the editor believed that the text that follows is the beginning of a letter, whereas it is actually part of another letter.⁷⁷

Finally, the frequent use of a capital letter in designating a person instead of giving the full name in the correspondence edited by Clerselier, suggests that Descartes abbreviated personal names in his drafts. In two cases, we know for certain that Clerselier expanded these abbreviations and made a wrong conjecture. In two letters he printed ‘Le Roy’, believing that the ‘R’ in the draft stood for Regius, whereas Descartes actually meant Reneri.⁷⁸

4. *The reconstruction of the letters.* There are basically three methods to uncover these modifications. First, on the basis of remarks in the *Exemplaire de l’Institut*, in which numerous autograph letters are collated with Clerselier’s texts, indicating Clerselier’s mistakes in his reconstruction of the letters (in some cases the autograph letters examined by the annotators of the *Exemplaire de l’Institut* are still missing, leaving the precious notes in the *Exemplaire* as our only source). The second method to uncover Clerselier’s patchwork is by way of resurfaced original letters or (manuscript) copies. Finally, it is possible to divide a text presented by Clerselier as one letter on internal evidence and historical sources. As an example of the last method take CLE I letter 110, which text is split into three parts in AT and CM. The first and the third part date doubtless from April or May 1637, as the contents make it clear that the *Discours* has been printed though Descartes is still waiting for the privilege.⁷⁹ In the second part, however, Descartes writes that he has not yet seen Gibieuf’s *De libertate Dei* (Paris 1630), which work the philosopher read in 1631.⁸⁰

As regards Clerselier’s first volume, the editors of AT and CM make a reasonable case that four items actually consist of two or more (fragmentary) letters. Letter 110, addressed ‘A Monsieur ***’, consists of three fragmentary letters, the first probably to Germain Habert, the other fragments to Mersenne.⁸¹ Letter 111 comprises a complete letter and a fragment of another letter, both presumably to Mersenne.⁸² Letter 112 is made up of no less than three different fragments, presumably addressed to Mersenne

⁷⁷ Cf. AT II 330/CM VIII 58.

⁷⁸ Descartes to Mersenne, 23 August 1638, AT II 330/CM VIII 58; Descartes to ***, [12 September 1638], AT II 379. The first mistake was already noticed by Baillet (*Vie*, II, 20).

⁷⁹ CLE I letter 110, part 1: to [Habert?], [27 April 1637?], AT I 368–371/CM VI 263–264; CLE I letter 110, part 3: to [Mersenne], AT I 365–368/CM VI 260–262. The editors of AT and CM disagree on the precise date of all three letters.

⁸⁰ CLE I letter 110, part 2: to [Mersenne?], [27 May 1630?], AT I 151–154/CM II 490–493. Cf. Descartes to Mersenne, [October 1631?], AT I 219–220/CM III 21.

⁸¹ See notes 79 and 80.

⁸² To Mersenne, 20 November 1629, AT I 76–82/CM II 323–329; 18 December 1629, AT I 86–87/CM II 336–338.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

and Mesland.⁸³ Finally, letter 116 consists of two fragments as well.⁸⁴

Even if we include the number of letters to Regius which actually comprise several fragmentary letters (see below), the first volume still contains the least number of mutilated letters. This can be explained, partly, because the letters to Elizabeth and Chanut seem to have been not very defective, partly because the first volume does not contain many letters to Mersenne, which collection proved to be the most vulnerable. In the second volume, 22 items consist of various fragments, the third volume 9 items. The majority of these are letters to Mersenne.⁸⁵

2.1.4. Clerselier's interventions: Descartes' letters to Regius

1. *Addressee.* Every letter to Regius is clearly marked as such by Clerselier's announcement *Clarissimo Viro Henrico Regio*, followed by the number of the letter in his edition in Roman numerals. However, the first letter is introduced with a reservation — a reservation which applies to all subsequent letters: *Clarissimo Viro Henrico Regio. Si bene divinavi.* The reservation is cancelled in the second edition. Apparently, Regius' reaction to the publication was evidence enough to convince Clerselier that his conjecture about the addressee of the letters was correct.

2. *Date.* The definitive conclusion that the letters are addressed to Regius, is not Clerselier's only response to Regius' criticism. Before sending the second edition to the press, he reconsidered the chronological order of the letters to Regius as well. The result is probably not due to attentive reading of the letters themselves alone. In the preface of his 1664 edition of Descartes' *L'Homme*, Clerselier acknowledged that he possessed copies of the letters Regius wrote to Descartes (cf. § 1.2.1). The chronological order in the second edition was indeed much improved. In fact, Adam and Tannery replaced only four letters in the chronological sequence established by Clerselier in the second edition.⁸⁶

3. *Establishment of the text.* Very little can be said of the way Clerselier established the published text of Descartes' letters to Regius from the manuscripts, because the Stockholm papers as well as the autograph letters are lost. Nevertheless, a few observations can be made.

⁸³ To Mersenne, [6 May 1630], AT I 147–150/CM II 479–482; to [Mesland?], [9 February 1645?], AT III 378–382, cf. AT IV 172–175; to Mersenne, [March 1637], AT I 347–351/CM VI 232–236.

⁸⁴ To [Vatier], [17 November 1642], AT III 594–597; to [Mesland], [1645 or 1646], AT IV 348–350.

⁸⁵ Most reshuffling of the letters in CLE II and CLE III can be traced in the concordance between CLE and AT (AT V 701–705). The following letters have subsequently been divided by the editors of CM: CLE II no. 76; CLE II letter 103 (into four parts instead of three in AT); CLE II letter 111. In several cases the editors of CM differ from Adam and Tannery in dating certain parts. That the problem does not exclusively concern the letters to Mersenne, is shown by CLE III letter 117, a letter to Van Schooten (9 April 1649, AT V 336–338). The existence of a manuscript copy of the second part of CLE III letter 117, published in AT V 565–566, makes it clear that Clerselier's text actually consists of two distinct letters.

⁸⁶ See my concordances between the first edition of CLE I, its second edition and AT

Introduction

First, the specification *editionis gallicae* in D/R 45 [January 1642] when Descartes refers to his *Essais* (*Discours* 1637) is clearly added by Clerselier, since no translation of the *Essais* was available in January 1642 (the Latin translation was published in 1644).⁸⁷

Second, the manuscript copies rediscovered at Debrecen (D/R 34 and D/R 35) have a salutation and a valediction similar to those in the texts published by Clerselier. Of course, this does not guarantee the authenticity of those in Clerselier's texts, but it does mean that we need to suspend judgement in this matter.

Finally, several passages in the letters as published by Clerselier reappear almost verbatim in Regius' disputations of 1641 and his *Responsio* (1642). They bear witness to Clerselier's trustworthiness.

4. *Reconstruction of the letters.* Clerselier indicates that of two letters to Regius he had only the first part (D/R 19A and D/R 24). But this does not mean that the other letters form a complete whole. Adam and Tannery have their doubts about some letters, but they are cautious not to divide any of them. They are right in this respect regarding D/R 38, which text cannot possibly reflect the text of the letter actually sent, but is impossible to reconstruct it.⁸⁸ Adam and Tannery also render two letters liable to the suspicion of being made up of (fragments of) two different letters (AT nos. 240 and 266), and in these cases I am less scrupulous than the editors of the great Descartes edition.⁸⁹ I divide AT no. 240 into D/R 19B and D/R 20, and I consider AT no. 239 (D/R 19A) as a rough draft of D/R 19B, the latter being either a final draft or a copy. This decision is solely founded on internal evidence of the letters. In my decision to divide AT no. 266 into D/R 31 and D/R 33, more or less along the lines suggested in AT, I also made use of a source unavailable to Adam and Tannery, namely one of the letters rediscovered at Debrecen (D/R 35).

I also divide AT no. 190, until now completely unsuspected of being made up by fragments of various letters. In AT, as in the second edition of CLE, it is Descartes' first extant letter to Regius, and the only letter with a specific date (24 May 1640). I have established that Clerselier's text consists of no less than 5 fragments of different letters: D/R 13, D/R 15, D/R 22, D/R 23 and D/R 27. This remarkable result is obtained by carefully comparing Regius' disputations of 1641, in which the Utrecht professor sometimes quotes literally from Descartes' letters.

2.2. *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes* by Adrien Baillet (1691)

In 1691 Adrien Baillet (1649–1706) published his biography of Descartes, *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*, in two large volumes (totaling over a thousand pages). The

⁸⁷ Cf. D/R 31, l. 12.

⁸⁸ See my comments on D/R 38.

⁸⁹ My arguments for dividing some of the texts published by Clerselier are found in my commentary on the respective letters.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

biography deals with every aspect of Descartes' life, his ancestry, his education, his travels abroad, his works, both published and unpublished, his daily life, his appearance. The result is nothing short of an exhaustive encyclopedia on Descartes, in which, aided by the painstakingly detailed indexes, an answer to almost any question on the philosopher's life can be found. The work is backed by numerous sources, which Baillet conscientiously cites in the margins of his work. Indeed, the margins are littered with references to published as well as unpublished sources. The latter sources make the interest of Baillet's work today; the majority of these sources are no longer available to us, including Regius' letters to Descartes. But the treasure has its price: despite the appearance of exactitude brought about by the marginal references the information Baillet gives is in many cases mistaken. Indeed, any answer the biography may supply needs to be treated with circumspection, unless it is backed by independent sources.

Several factors are responsible for the fallibility of Baillet's work. First, the astonishing speed with which the work was completed: according to Baillet's own biographer it took Baillet less than a year to write it.⁹⁰ Now, Baillet was in fact working on the material left by Clerselier before that. In the second half of 1688 Baillet agreed to assist Legrand in sorting out the material for a biography and in collecting additional sources. In due course, Baillet's role shifted from secretary to author, and early in 1690 he started the actual writing. The decision that Baillet should write the biography, and not Legrand, was taken by others, who more or less forced Baillet to accept the job. A better choice was hardly imaginable as Baillet had already proved that he could deal with loads of material and nevertheless produce voluminous works at short notice. Despite these excellent characteristics, inconsistencies, mistakes and confusion arisen from haste had not been avoided.

A second reason for a careful approach to Baillet's work, is the fact that the author does not always indicate the border-line between fact and fiction. At times he shows a critical assessment of his sources, or he indicates the problematic interpretation of data, but in other cases the reconstruction of Descartes' life springs from Baillet's imagination alone. Finally, his unfamiliarity with the Protestant Low Countries, where Descartes spent most of his adult life, is a third cause of mistakes.⁹¹

⁹⁰ For the details on Baillet and the genesis of *Vie*, I rely on SEBBA 1982. Another interesting study on Baillet's biography is COLE 1992, ch. 2 (Cole sketches the difference of opinion between Adam, Gouhier, Sebba and himself on pp. 239–240).

⁹¹ Immediately after the publication, many errors were indicated by several people, including Christiaan Huygens, who recorded mistake after mistake (HUYGENS 1888–1950, X, 399–406; also in COUSIN 1865–1866, III, t. 1, 112–120). Criticism of a wholly different kind was voiced as well: the abundance of 'irrelevant' details and marginal references made enjoyable reading impossible. In response to the latter critics, Baillet published in 1692 an abridged version without references. The second *Vie* was apparently to the public's liking, as it went through a reprint the next year. For the reception of Baillet's *Vie*, see also WANG 1963, 323–331.

Introduction

All three factors must be kept in mind when considering Baillet's account of the relation between Descartes and Regius. A rewarding source for Baillet was Clerselier's collection of copies of Regius' letters to Descartes. In the margin of his work, Baillet refers to no less than 33 different letters, often giving the number of the letter in the collection and/or the date of the letter.⁹² On the other hand, it is not always clear how Baillet used his source. Obviously, when Baillet uses quotation marks, there is no problem in connecting the reference in the margin to the main text. However, these cases are outnumbered by less straightforward references. Often, the boundary between the bit of information taken from a letter and the surrounding material is not evident, especially when several marginal references are found. In those cases, only context and secondary sources may shed some light. An illuminating example is the following, taken from a correspondence with very similar problems, namely Descartes' letters to Claude Picot, which are primarily known from Baillet's *Vie*. The setting is the summer of 1644, when Descartes is in France and finally receives a set of copies of his *Principia*, printed in Amsterdam. In the margin, Baillet refers to a letter to Picot of 29 July 1644:

M. Descartes, arrivant à Paris, trouva l'Abbé Picot et le P. Mersenne occupés du soin d'envoyer dans les Provinces du Royaume les exemplaires de ses *Principes* destinés pour les amis de dehors [*in margine*: Lettr. MS du 29 Juillet à Picot]; mais qui attendaient l'Auteur pour lui laisser la satisfaction de faire lui-même ses présents à ceux de la Ville [*in margine*: le P. Mersenne était sur le point de faire son voyage].⁹³

At first sight, the passage appears to be Baillet's paraphrase of the letter, in which Descartes thanked Picot for his and Mersenne's efforts in distributing copies of the *Principia*, when he arrived in Paris from the Netherlands. A closer inspection of the preceding chapter in *Vie* makes it clear that that is not the case. In the preceding chapter Baillet gives a detailed account (based upon the letters to Picot!) of Descartes' journey to Brittany after his departure from Paris around 11 July.⁹⁴ Consequently, 'arrivant à Paris' means 'when Descartes arrived in Paris from Brittany'. So the letter in question was actually written before copies of the *Principia* arrived in Paris, which finally happened in August 1644 while Descartes was staying in Brittany.⁹⁵ We may draw two conclusions. First, the only piece of information which Baillet took from the letter, is Descartes' request to Picot to distribute copies of the *Principia*, when these copies will arrive in Paris. Second, starting from this request made before the copies arrived in Paris, Baillet invented a small history of what happened after they had arrived in Paris.

⁹² In § 2.3.1 I summarise my observations on the Clerselier collection of Regius' letters.

⁹³ *Vie*, II, 221; AT IV 130.

⁹⁴ Cf. AT IV 128.

⁹⁵ Cf. AT IV 138.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

The second conclusion brings us back to Baillet's imagination, the fruit of which is also present in Baillet's account of the Descartes–Regius correspondence. The worst example is found precisely in Baillet's account of the first contacts between Descartes and Regius.⁹⁶ In other instances, Baillet's story is so terribly confused that it is impossible to make sense of it.⁹⁷ And, finally, there is his misunderstanding of the Dutch situation.⁹⁸

There is no general approach to dealing with these problems, except for collecting secondary sources and reading the passages in context. Fortunately, something can be said in favour of Baillet. He does not always take things for granted, and sometimes he does mention that it is difficult to make head or tail of some aspects in the correspondence between Descartes and Regius. Moreover, thanks to his passion for details, or his meticulous regard for concrete reality as Sebba puts it, we can draw a fairly good picture of the relation between Descartes and Regius, sometimes even when the biographer errs.

2.3. The Exemplaire de l'Institut

The so called *Exemplaire de l'Institut* (*ExI*) is a copy of Clerselier's three volume edition of Descartes' correspondence which is kept in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France in Paris. The volumes are part of the manuscript department of the library (shelf marks MS 4469, 4470, 4471) because the works are riddled with numerous additional notes in handwriting. The *Exemplaire de l'Institut* is presumably the personal copy of Clerselier's edition of Jean-Baptiste Legrand, who used it in his preparation for a new edition of Descartes' correspondence (see § 1.2.2). The notes are the result of these preparations. Many letters, mostly to Mersenne which Clerselier was unable to consult, are collated with autograph letters. Every letter contains one or more notes which comment upon the addressee and the date of the letter. Unfortunately, the authors of the various hands which can be distinguished still remain to be identified with certainty, but there is only a limited number of candidates, namely Clerselier, Legrand, Baillet and the last person to have access to the entire collection, Marmion. According to Adam, one of the hands is without question Legrand's, but he refrains from saying which one in particular.⁹⁹

The letters I examined in the *ExI*, the letters to Regius, have two sets of notes, each in a different hand, which are easily distinguished. Notes by, what I will call, the *first*

⁹⁶ See my commentary on R/D 1.

⁹⁷ For example in R/D 16B.

⁹⁸ An amusing example is Baillet's insistence that Regius during his stay at Naarden ran into trouble with the Amsterdam *fleet*, Baillet's literal translation of *Classis* (*Vie*, II, 5; cf. DE VRIJER 1917, 13). For Regius' Naarden episode, see the *Regius Chronicle*.

⁹⁹ AT I xlix. Except for Adam's remarks in his introduction to Descartes' correspondence (AT I XLVIII–LIII, LXII–LXV) there is no secondary literature on the *Exemplaire de l'Institut*. The announced photographic reprint of the *Exemplaire de l'Institut*, (J.-R. Armogathe and G. Belgioioso (eds.), Lecce: Conte) will disclose this important source and undoubtedly enable a closer analysis.

Introduction

hand, are found in the margin next to the head of a letter. The notes by the *second hand* — in an at times almost indecipherable handwriting — are written on separate pieces of paper inserted in their appropriate places in Clerselier's edition. As an example of both sets of notes I give their comments on Descartes' letter 96 in the first volume (*ExI*, I, 429). According to the annotators, the letter dates from July 1645. The note *in margine* by the first hand reads:

La missive de Mr le Roy est du 13 juin 1645 p. 70. La reponse de Mr le Roy est du 6^e Juillet 1645, p. 71.¹⁰⁰

The note on an inserted leaflet by the second hand gives:

La 96 lettre du I Vol. est de M. D. a M. Reg., elle repond a la 32 de Reg. datée du 23 Juin 1645, ainsy celle cy est ecrite vers le commencement de juillet, je fixe cette reponse au 3^e juillet et je l'eloigne le plus qu'il m'est possible a cause que M. D. dans le commencement de cette lettre debute par dire: Je ne scay pourquoy j'ay été si longtemps sans vous faire reponse; cependant la reponse de M. R. a cette lettre est du 6^e juillet 1645, car on peut s'y convaincre par la lecture.

The notes of the second hand are more elaborate than the first set of notes, and they have a more definitive character. One of the notes in the second hand contains a reference to the *Narratio historica* — an account of the turbulent introduction of Cartesian philosophy at Utrecht University, published in 1643.¹⁰¹ Now, Baillet asked for this particular pamphlet in a letter to Niçaise.¹⁰² Baillet's letter is undated, but according to Sebba it dates from the second half of 1688.¹⁰³ If this is correct, the notes on the inserted leaflets are posterior to 1688. As the notes in the second hand render the first kind of notes obsolete, they presumably postdate the first notes.¹⁰⁴

The above example shows that the annotators used Regius' letters to provide Descartes' letters with a date as accurately as possible. However, as it turns out, the annotators were not particularly successful, for the letter they discuss above, D/R 17 in the present edition, does not date from 1645 but from 1641.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, although the annotators possessed many of Regius' letters, they often err in their conclusions. Indeed, the importance of the *ExI* for the Descartes–Regius correspondence is not

¹⁰⁰ The entire note was cancelled, possibly by the author of the second note.

¹⁰¹ *ExI*, I, 416; note on an inserted leaflet.

¹⁰² Baillet to Niçaise, undated letter, BnF, FF 9361, ff. 172–173. The letter is published in COUSIN 1865–1866, IV, 110–111.

¹⁰³ SEBBA 1982, 52.

¹⁰⁴ In their preliminary remarks on a letter of Descartes to [Princess Sophie], Adam and Tannery discuss one of the notes by the second hand, claiming that the handwriting is Legrand's (AT IV 495). However, as they do not indicate how they arrive at their conclusion, I consider it a matter still open to debate.

¹⁰⁵ See my commentary on D/R 17.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

due to the conjectures on the date of Descartes' letters, but to the information these inferences supply on Regius' letters. The notes mention the exact dates of Regius' letters and sometimes even refer to the number of the letter in the collection. The *ExI* is in this respect not as rich as Baillet's *Vie*, because for several of Descartes' letters the annotators found no counterpart in the collection of Regius' letters. Nevertheless, the notes confirm many of Baillet's dates, sometimes supply an indication regarding the calendar (the Gregorian or the Julian calendar), and in one case the date of a letter not mentioned by Baillet (R/D 44). Further, the notes in the *ExI* occasionally give details on the contents of Regius' letters which are not found in Baillet's *Vie*. The most interesting bits of information are found in notes appended to Descartes' letters to other people than Regius, in which the annotators used Regius' letters to establish dates and/or addressees. Finally, Clerselier's text of Descartes' letters to Regius in the *ExI* shows changes in the text, but these are for the greater part nothing but corrections of printer's errors and stylistic changes. Indeed, they cannot be anything else, as the annotators never got hold of the autograph letters to Regius.

2.3.1. The Clerselier collection of Regius' letters to Descartes

We do not know how Clerselier obtained the copies of Regius' letters to Descartes. He may have discovered the collection among the Stockholm papers, but it is not inconceivable that he received it on a later date from someone in the Netherlands. But it is certain that by 1664 he possessed the collection, which he presumably made use of to rearrange the order of Descartes' letters in the second edition of the first volume (1663). After Clerselier's death, the collection appears to have gone to his heirs at first, but was later retrieved by Legrand when he decided to prepare a completely new edition of Descartes' correspondence, which edition, had it materialised, possibly would have included Regius' letters as well (see § 1.2.1).

Baillet's *Vie* and the annotations in the *ExI* provide the following picture of the collection. Each letter in the collection was numbered and the whole was paginated. Both Baillet and the annotators in the *ExI* refer to the numbered items, the first hand in the *ExI* gives several references to the page number of the letter as well. The last reference in the *ExI* is to Regius' letter of 23 July 1645, number 34 in the collection, having page number 77.¹⁰⁶ The highest number Baillet refers to is number 37. The collection contained at least two letters from another albeit closely connected correspondence. Baillet refers to a letter by Regius' colleague Antonius Æmilius to Descartes, no. 9 in the collection (ÆM/D 5), and a letter to Cornelis van Hogelande, no. 37 in the collection

¹⁰⁶ *ExI*, I, 430 (letter 97), *in margine*: 'La reponse de Mr le Roy est du 23 juillet 1645, p. 77.' Just like the note I quoted above, this note was cancelled as well.

Introduction

(R/VH 54). As the last letter is not addressed to Descartes, it may have been the last item of the collection as well.

Some further observations can be made. The collection was not complete. The most dramatic gap is 1641, of which year the collection had just one letter, whereas we have numerous letters of Descartes of that year. In the *ExI* none of the letters in the collection is used to date any of these letters. The only letter of 1641 is no. 14; no. 15 dates from 1642. The letters were more or less chronologically arranged; but there were letters without date. Letters 8 to 10 apparently had no date, as Baillet does not mention them, and the *ExI* does use letters 8 and 10 but does not mention the date either. If Baillet does not mention the date, it does not necessarily mean that the letter had no date at all. Just a few letters are not mentioned by Baillet or the *ExI* at all, namely nos. 2, 7, 28, 29, 35. The first two of these are probably R/D 3 and R/D 10. According to Baillet and the *ExI* letter 34 is the last letter exchanged between Regius and Descartes. Letter 35 is mentioned nowhere.

Regius lived in Utrecht, which province adhered to the old Julian calendar (Old Style: OS), as opposed to the new Gregorian calendar (New Style: NS) used by Descartes in Holland.¹⁰⁷ Baillet is aware of the difference, but mentions both dates of a letter only once (R/D 14B). Baillet is moreover not consistent; he may either give the date in OS or in NS. The same applies to the first hand annotator, but the second hand annotator, insofar as I was able to determine, only uses NS. That is why when both hands in the *ExI* give the same date of a letter, the date is presumably in NS.

2.4. Debrecen

A manuscript copy of two short letters by Descartes to Regius, D/R 34 and D/R 35 in the present edition, is found in a notebook by Johannes Dállyai Vas in Utrecht in 1710. These letters are not published in Clerselier's edition of Descartes' correspondence. The notebook is kept in the Library of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District and the Reformed College, Debrecen, Hungary, shelf mark R 164.¹⁰⁸

The cover title of the manuscript reads *J. Dallyai Vas, Her. Alexandri Röelli, Theologia sive Religio Rationalis*. The manuscript consists of 262 ff., and measures 210 x 170 mm. Foliation starts only at f. 230v; the preceding part of the manuscript is paginated.

A librarian's note, giving information on the provenance, is found on f. [1r]. Ff. [1v–9v] are blank. The notebook, headed *Theologia Naturalis*, covers ff. [10–230r], pp. 1–445 [=444]. On page [444], erroneously paginated 445, the notice *Finis cum bono*

¹⁰⁷ See my introductory note on the calendars in the Dutch Republic.

¹⁰⁸ Catalogued in FEKETE/SZABÓ 1979, 40. The letters are published in ESZE 1973, with a photographic reproduction of the manuscript, and in DIBON 1985/DIBON 1990, 551–577.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

Deo. Trajecti ad Rhenum 1710, 27 Junij. There follow 8 blank pages (paginated 446 [=445], 247–253), and an *Addendum Theologia Naturalis*, with the double pagination 254–260 and 445–451 (sic). Two appendices, *De aeternitate Dei* (ff. 230v–234r), *De scientia Dei* (234v–238r), and an *Index rerum* (ff. 239r–245r) complete the notebook. Ff. 245v–259r are blank. The copies of the letters to Regius are on f. 259v (D/R 34) and f. 260r (D/R 35), preceded by the announcement *Copia Epistolarum Carthesii ad Cl. Regium Doctorem et Prof. Medicinae Ultrajectensem ex Ms. praefati transcripta* (f. 259v). Ff. 260v–262v are blank.

The lecture notes and the copies of Descartes' letters are in the same hand (Dállyai Vas'). The fact that the copyist tried to imitate Descartes' signature (cf. D/R 34) suggests that the copies are made after autograph letters.

The manuscript was donated by the widow of Dállyai Vas, Zsuzsánna Zemlényi, to the archives of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District at Debrecen on 20 January 1719 (according to a note on f. [1r]).

Background

The copyist of Descartes' letters is the Hungarian student János (Johannes) Dállyai Vas or Was, who in 1709, after his studies at the Calvinist Reformed College of Debrecen, travelled to the Netherlands to complete his theological education at the universities of Utrecht and Franeker.¹⁰⁹ His presence in Utrecht is attested from October 1709 till March 1711.¹¹⁰ In Utrecht he was a student of the theologian Herman Alexander Röell (1653–1718), who was popular and influential among Hungarian students.¹¹¹ In the spring of 1711, he matriculated at the university of Franeker, where he met the famous theologian Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722) and the Cartesian philosopher Ruardus Andala (1665–1727).¹¹² In July 1711 he returned to Hungary via Frankfurt a/d Oder.¹¹³

109 For Dállyai Vas, see apart from the sources given below, ESZE 1973, and SLUIS/POSTMA 1990, 35. Esze's information on Dállyai Vas' stay in the Netherlands contains some inaccuracies. The peregrination of Protestant Hungarian students to Utrecht University between 1636 and 1836 is studied in SEGESVÁRY 1935. For the number of Hungarian students at the University of Leiden, see WANSINK 1981, 11.

110 Mention in the *Album amicorum* of Dállyai Vas' fellow countryman János Szárosi, dd. 30 October 1709 (Debrecen, R 685, f. 93r). The first reference in Utrecht in Dállyai Vas' own *Album amicorum* (Debrecen, R 687) dates from 10 March 1710 (f. 145r); the last one from 27 March 1711 (f. 112r). Dállyai Vas did not matriculate at the university, probably because he did not need to pay any fee (cf. SEGESVÁRY 1935, 23, 24).

111 Röell's entry in Dállyai Vas' *Album amicorum* is dated Utrecht, 19 March 1711 (f. 55r; text in ESZE 1973, 232). Dállyai Vas' familiarity with the Röell family is attested by the inscriptions of Röell's eldest sons Johannes (f. 110v) and Dionysius (f. 110r). On H. A. Röell, see NNBW, X, 821–823; B LGNP, IV, 372–374; VAN SLUIS 1988; VAN SLUIS/POSTMA 1990 (study of Röell and his Hungarian students).

112 *Album. Stud. Acad. Fran.*, 298 (*Johannes Was Dallyai, Hungarus, gratis*). Entries of both Franeker professors are found in Dállyai Vas' album: Vitringa (27 July 1711, f. 57r), Andala (6 Id. Jul. 1711, f. 65r).

113 The last entries made in Franeker in Dállyai Vas' album are of 10 July 1711 (ff. 53r, 79r, 141v). On 29 July 1711 he visited the university at Frankfurt a/d Oder (ff. 49r, 50r, 135r). The date of inscription on f. 137r by a German student, Johannes Wolfen, Utrecht 26 December 1711, is probably mistaken.

Introduction

Shortly after his arrival in Debrecen he was appointed professor of theology at the Reformed College of Debrecen (1711–1715).¹¹⁴ During the last years of his life Dállyai Vas was a minister at Debrecen. He died prematurely in 1718.

Dállyai Vas probably copied the letters out of curiosity — perhaps Descartes' mention of the great Reformed theologian Voetius helped as well (cf. D/R 34) — and as a souvenir of the historical person Descartes, whose philosophy inspired both his preceptors at Debrecen and Utrecht. He was introduced to Cartesianism by his professor at the Reformed College of Debrecen, the Cartesio-Cocceian theologian and philosopher Martinus Tönkö (1642–1700).¹¹⁵ It is no coincidence that he spent most of his time in the Netherlands in Utrecht, where Röell taught, who is renowned for his reconciliation of Cartesian philosophy with Reformed theology.¹¹⁶ We have no indication as to the owner of the autographs or when Dállyai Vas copied the letters. It is possible that Röell once acquired them for the same reasons as Dállyai Vas copied them out, but the latter's *Album amicorum* contains an contribution by another Utrecht professor who may have found the letters equally interesting, the Cartesian professor of philosophy and mathematics Joseph Serrurier (†1742).¹¹⁷ In absence of any information on the owner of the autographs, nothing can be said as to how the letters got detached from Regius' collection of Descartes' letters.¹¹⁸

3. THE PRESENT EDITION

3.1. *The arrangement of the correspondence*

Text

The head-note of every letter in the present edition gives the number, date and, in Descartes' case, place of writing (whether or not Regius wrote all his letters from

114 Written communication by Dr. Cs. Fekete, Senior Librarian of the Library of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District and the Reformed College, Debrecen.

115 On Márton Szilágyi (Martinus Sylvanus) Tönkö, who introduced Cartesianism at the Reformed College of Debrecen, see TURÓCZI-TROSTLER 1934, 119–120, TORDAI 1964, 150–151, ESZE 1973, 213, and TÓTH 1979, 419–422, 437. The history of Hungarian Cartesianism starts with János Csere Apáczai (1625–1659), who between 1648 and 1653 studied at Franeker, Leiden, and Harderwijk, but mostly at Utrecht University, under Voetius and Regius. He married an Utrecht girl, Aletta van der Maet, and his ambition was to get a professorship in Utrecht, but eventually he returned to Hungary, where he became professor at the colleges of Gyulafehérvára and Kolozsvár. In 1653, he published the first encyclopedia in the Hungarian language, which for (natural) philosophy, medicine and psychology draws almost exclusively on Descartes' *Principia philosophiae* and Regius' *Fundamenta physices* and *Fundamenta medica*, sometimes giving literal translations (APÁCZAI 1653). For Apáczai, see besides the studies in the history of Cartesianism in Hungary cited above, the monograph BÁN 1954 (French summary on pp. 563–585).

116 Dállyai Vas indeed embraced Röell's views in theology. Esze reports that one of Dállyai Vas' former students at Debrecen, who had never studied abroad, was charged with heresy because of his Röellian Christology (ESZE 1973, 235–236).

117 R 687, f. 62v. For Serrurier, see *Album Stud. Rhen.-Trai.*, XVIII; THUISSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 451–453.

118 Cf. § 1.1.3.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

Utrecht cannot be established, but I assume that he did). Conjectural dates are put between square brackets.¹¹⁹ I then give the source of the text, which is CLE I (1663) and the Debrecen manuscript for Descartes' letters to Regius, and *Vie* and the *ExI* for Regius' letters to Descartes. If the number of a letter by Regius in the Clerselier collection is known, this will be specified. Next, I list the place of the letter in the standard edition of Adam and Tannery (AT), and finally, I indicate the most common (AM, RL and CSMK) or otherwise interesting (M and B) translations of Descartes' letters.

The line numbering is found in the left margin of the texts. In case a letter of Regius consists of more than one passage from *Vie*, the line numbering starts anew with each passage. These passages themselves are alphabetically listed [A], [B], and so on.

I use two sequences of notes. In the textual notes, listed by line number, I record variant readings, emendations, etc. Explanatory notes are keyed to superscript numbers.

Commentary

Since many letters are in need of annotation on date, text and/or context, each letter has a separate commentary. In the commentary I discuss respectively date (*Date*), my arrangement of the text (*Text*), and if necessary an elaborate note on the (historical) context of the letter (*Context*). In some cases, it is inevitable that I discuss the date of a letter and its context at the same time.

3.2. The establishment of the text

The different kinds of sources in which (remnants of) the correspondence between Descartes and Regius are found, necessitate a different approach to each source.

3.2.1. Clerselier's Lettres de Mr Descartes

The basis of the texts is the second edition of Clerselier's first volume of Descartes' correspondence (1663), which I collated with the first edition (1657).¹²⁰ The spelling of the long *s*, and of *u* and *v* has been made conform to modern usage for the convenience of the reader. In the rare cases that a *j* is used instead of an *i*, for example in 'major' or 'alijs', I have replaced the *j* with an *i*. However, I have respected the rule that if a word ends with a double *ii*, the last *i* is represented as an *j*, to which rule I found no exceptions. The ampersand (&) and the ligatures *æ* and *œ* are presented as *et*, *ae* and *oe*, and instantly recognisable contractions have been silently expanded. Word accents have

¹¹⁹ On the double date of Regius' letters to Descartes, see my introductory note on the calendars in the Dutch Republic.

¹²⁰ For the first edition (Paris 1657), I used a copy of the University Library of Leiden (546 B 13); for the second edition (Paris 1663), I used a copy of the University Library of Utrecht (Dijns 22-215).

Introduction

been reproduced on the basis of the second edition. Obvious misprints have been silently corrected. Variant readings between the first and the second edition are indicated in the critical apparatus beneath the main text. Corrections and conjectures are justified in the same apparatus. Additions are put between angle brackets. Initials have been expanded between angle brackets, unless there are doubts about the identity of the person meant. Interventions in the indentation of the second edition of Clerselier are mentioned. The pagination of Clerselier's second edition and AT is indicated in the right margin, the latter between square brackets and in italics.

In many of his letters to Regius, Descartes discusses drafts of disputations or other texts the Utrecht professor intended to publish. In his suggestions, approval or disapproval Descartes often alludes to or cites from the texts Regius had sent to him. In general, Clerselier indicates these words and passages, but he either uses italics or a capital letter. For instance, he uses italics in 'Ubi habes *vicinus aër cuius particulae*, etc. malle *vicinus aër*, etc. *potest*', but a capital letter in the following passage: 'In secundo, ais Idiopathiam esse morbum per se subsistentem; malle dicere, esse ab alio non pendentem'.¹²¹ For want of a uniform approach, I have decided to follow the practice of AT, in which edition all these words and passages are italicised. In general, the differences with Clerselier's second edition are not mentioned. As the use of italics involves changes in the original punctuation and capitalisation, I follow AT's usage in these respects as well.

3.2.2. Baillet's *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*

The basis of the text is the Geneva 1970 Slatkine reprint. Printing errors indicated in the list of errata have been corrected, which explains some differences with the text presented in AT. Obvious misprints have been silently corrected. The remaining corrections are in angle brackets and they are justified in the critical apparatus. Baillet's references in the margin of his work have been inserted in the main text between square brackets, preceded by the abbreviation *i.m.* (*in margine*).

The text is printed in an 10 point instead of a 12 point letter to stress the fact that we are not dealing with the original source, unless it is unambiguously clear that Baillet gives a direct quotation from Regius' letter (regrettably in a French translation). Because *Vie* does not reflect Regius' original wording, I have taken the liberty to modernise the spelling, for which purpose I used the edition by Adam and Milhaud (AM). In case a passage from *Vie* was not found in AM, the modernisation is mine. The use of the uppercase letter has been made conform to modern usage, except in the case of months, institutions, and academic, church and public offices. Punctuation has only slightly been

121 D/R 22, ll. 2–3; D/R 24, ll. 8–9.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

adapted to modern usage. Commas have been added if this enhanced the understanding of the text. Unnecessary colons have been replaced by a semicolon.

3.2.3. Exemplaire de l'Institut

My reproduction of the notes in *ExI* is strictly diplomatic, except for the punctuation, which is virtually absent in the notes, and the original lineation. Additions and corrections by the authors of the notes in *ExI* are not indicated. My additions are put between angle brackets.

3.2.4. Debrecen

I collated Dibon's transcription from the photographic reproduction published by Esze with the original manuscripts in Debrecen.¹²² Seeing that my text of both letters was based upon the first authoritative transcription, I limited the number of modifications. Small and unambiguous contractions are silently expanded. The minor corrections by the copyist are not indicated.

¹²² ESZE 1973, 230–231.

INTRODUCTORY NOTES TO THE CORRESPONDENCE

1. THE CALENDARS IN THE DUTCH REPUBLIC

In the 17th century, there was a difference of ten days between Holland, Zeeland and Brabant on the one hand, and the other provinces of the Dutch Republic on the other hand. In the first three provinces, the new, Gregorian calendar was in use, while the remaining part of the Dutch Republic adhered to the old Julian calendar.¹²³ In the commentary as in the footnotes to the letters all dates are either according to the Gregorian calendar alone, or, when discussing Regius' letters and events that took place in that part of the Netherlands that adhered to the Old Style, I supply both the date in the Julian and in the Gregorian calendar, or add the abbreviation OS (Old Style). The date of publication of Regius' *Responsio* is thus 16/26 February 1642. Descartes, who lived in Holland during his correspondence with Regius, dated his letters in the New Style (NS), but Regius, living in Utrecht, probably dated his letters to Descartes both in the Old Style and in the New Style. Baillet rarely supplies both dates, so often we do not know which calendar, the Julian or the Gregorian, is used. In case I succeeded in establishing the correct date, I designate the date of the letter in both styles, the calendar not used by Baillet in square brackets. For example, I date Regius' first letter to Descartes [8/] 18 August 1638, meaning that Baillet only gives the date 18 August but that I have established that the precise date is 18 August New Style.

2. UTRECHT UNIVERSITY 1636–1650

It took only two years for the Illustrious School at Utrecht, founded in 1634, to be raised to the status of university.¹²⁴ On 16/26 March 1636, a solemn celebration in the Domchurch, in the presence of members of the States of Utrecht, the Vroedschap, professors, students and numerous dignitaries, marked the birth of the fourth university in the Protestant Low Countries, after Leiden (1575), Franeker (1585) and Groningen

¹²³ For more details, see STRUBBE/VOET 1960. Easter Days in the Julian and Gregorian calendars are also listed in the *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, Appendix IV.

¹²⁴ For the early history of Utrecht University in general, see LONCQ 1886, KERNKAMP 1936 and BIERENS DE HAAN 1936. The philosophical curriculum till 1650 is studied in DIBON 1954 and VERBEEK 1992A. The Theological Faculty is closely studied in DUKER 1989, II and III; the records of the Faculty are published in CRAMER 1932. TEN DOESSCHATE 1963 is a mediocre attempt to outline the history of the Medical Faculty. For a survey of the Faculty of Law, see VAN DEN BERGH/SPRUIT/VAN DE VRUGT 1986 and WELTEN 1987. The minutes of the Academic Senate since 1640 — there are no records of the first four years — are found in KERNKAMP 1936–1940, I (cited as *Acta*). The records of the Utrecht Vroedschap (city council) concerning academic affairs are published in WIJNNE 1888 and KERNKAMP 1936–1940, I (cited as *Resoluiën*). KERNKAMP 1936–1940 summarises the records already present in WIJNNE 1888.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

(1614).¹²⁵ The *jus promovendi* was granted by the highest authority of the province, the States, but financially and administratively the university was an enterprise supported by the Utrecht Vroedschap alone. The board of governors, or *curatores*, counted no representatives of the States, as in other universities, but only members of the municipality. In Utrecht, the *Curatorium* consisted of the (two) Burgomasters, and some members of the Vroedschap. In fact it was most often the first Burgomaster who handled academic affairs.¹²⁶

From the outset Utrecht University prospered and attracted many students. The increase of students, partly due to the outbreak of the plague in Leiden in 1635, necessitated the Vroedschap to enlarge the staff. In 1634, the Illustrious School started with five professors, Gisbertus Voetius¹²⁷ (theology and Hebrew), Antonius Matthaeus¹²⁸ (law), the Faculty of Arts being represented by Henricus Reneri¹²⁹ (philosophy), Antonius Æmilius¹³⁰ (history) and Justus Liræus¹³¹ (humanities). In 1635, they were joined by Bernardus Schotanus,¹³² professor of law and mathematics, and three lecturers,

125 For a detailed account of the inaugural festivities, see *Academiae Ultrajectinae Inauguratio una cum orationibus inauguralibus* (Utrecht: Æg. and P. Roman, 1636). Cf. *Resolutiën*, 92–101; KERNKAMP 1936, 66–72.

126 KERNKAMP 1936–1940, I, VII–VIII; KERNKAMP 1936, 94.

127 *Resolutiën*, 55, 56–57. Biographical data of (former) professors of Utrecht University who play a significant role in the Descartes–Regius correspondence, are found in the *Biographical Lexicon*.

128 WIJNNE 1888, 5–6; *Resolutiën*, 36–37, 38. Anthonius Matthaeus (1601–1654), born in Herborn, studied in Marburg and Groningen, where he graduated in law in 1628 (*Album Stud. Acad. Gron.*, 445). Before his appointment in Utrecht, he was professor of civil law at the Illustrious School of Harderwijk (since 1629). His main work *Commentarius de criminibus* (MATTHAEUS 1644) knew numerous editions in the 17th and 18th centuries. BURMAN 1738, 213, 216–218; NNBW, VII, 846–848; SCHLÜTER 1929; VAN DE VRUGT 1986.

129 *Resolutiën*, 35, 36–37.

130 *Resolutiën*, 34.

131 *Resolutiën*, 33–34. Justus Liræus (Lyraeus), or Joost van Liere (c.1578–1646), was a student of Scaliger in Leiden. From 1598 till 1630, he taught at the Latin school in Middelburg. In 1630, he was appointed rector of the Hieronymus school in Utrecht, succeeding Æmilius. His direction, however, did not befit the school, and the Vroedschap decided to appoint Æmilius, next to his professorship, rector once again. Liræus was offered a position at the Illustrious School instead. BURMAN 1738, 198–200; NNBW, II, 819–820.

132 WIJNNE 1888, 5, 20–21; *Resolutiën*, 37, 79–80. Bernardus Schotanus, or Van Schooten, (1598–1652), studied philosophy, mathematics and law in Franeker, Leiden and Groningen. In 1622, Schotanus graduated in law at Franeker University, where he became professor of law in 1624. Utrecht University made him *Magister artium* in 1640. *Album Prom. Rhen.-Traj.*, 2. BURMAN 1738, 345–347; VAN DER AA, VI, 135–136; BOELES 1878–1889, II, 122–126; VAN LENNEP 1980. Bibliography: POSTMA/KRIKKE 1980.

Introductory Notes

Arnoldus van Goor¹³³ (moral philosophy), Arnoldus Senguerdus¹³⁴ (metaphysics) and Martin Schoock¹³⁵ (rhetoric). Shortly before the inauguration of the university Willem van der Straaten or Stratenus accepted the chair of medicine.¹³⁶

The Faculty of Theology was without question the most important department of the university, taking care of the education of ministers.¹³⁷ In 1637, Meinardus Schotanus¹³⁸ was appointed next to Voetius, followed by a third professor, Carolus Dematius¹³⁹ in 1639. Johannes Hoornbeeck succeeded Schotanus in 1644.¹⁴⁰ The doyen of the Faculty, and the star of the university, was Voetius, a charismatic and zealous orthodox Calvinist. Under his guidance the Faculty became a staunch guardian of Reformed doctrine, with a keen eye for practical theology. The professors of theology were also ministers in Utrecht, and they soon got a firm grip on the consistory, before long turning Utrecht into the center of Further Reformation.¹⁴¹ In academic life, Voetius' authority meant that he

133 *Resolutiën*, 79. Arnoldus van Goor (c.1607–after 1665) studied philosophy and theology in Germany (Helmstedt, Bremen), the Netherlands (Groningen, Leiden), England (Oxford) and Switzerland (Geneva and Basle). He became *Magister artium* in Leiden in 1635. On 8/18 October 1638 his father-in-law the Utrecht minister Andreas Suavius (†1649) asked the Vroedschap to grant Van Goor honourable discharge, as the Prince of Orange appointed him intendant of his native county of Meurs (WIJNNE 1888, 35–36. *Resolutiën*, 129). In 1660, Utrecht University made him Doctor of Law (*promotor*: P. Voet). Van Goor published a collection of ten disputations submitted over the years 1635–1637: *Disputationum philosophicarum practicarum pars prima: complectens ethicam generalem* (Utrecht: Æg. Roman, 1637; copy in the library of Utrecht University). One of the respondents is Paulus Voet. A second collection of disputations, *Collegium disputationum philosophiae practicae* (Utrecht 1638), is considered to be lost. BURMAN 1738, 106; VAN DER AA, III, 88; STELLING-MICHAUD 1959–1980, III, 501–502; *Album Prom. Rhen.-Traj.*, 16.

134 WIJNNE 1888, 39–40; *Resolutiën*, 80–81, 131. Arnoldus Senguerd(ius) (1610–1667) graduated in philosophy in Leiden in 1629, after which he continued his studies in Franeker. In 1648 he accepted the invitation to become the successor of Caspar Barlaeus at the Athenaeum in Amsterdam. BURMAN 1738, 355–357; DIBON 1954, 203–206, 241–246; LINDEBOOM 1984, 1800–1801.

135 WIJNNE 1888, 37–38; *Resolutiën*, 83, 127, 129.

136 *Resolutiën*, 89–90. Willem Stratenus (1593–1681) studied medicine in Leiden and graduated in Padua in 1613. He settled in practice in his native town, Utrecht, where he became physician and was charged with the teaching of anatomy to surgeons. In his inaugural oration he stressed the importance of clinical teaching. After his professorship at Leiden University, he returned to Utrecht, where he became Burgomaster (1674–1676). He published only a few medical works. BURMAN 1738, 363–364; VAN DER AA, VI, 324; BAUMANN 1951; POELHEKKE 1961, 313; LINDEBOOM 1984, 1896–1898.

137 Cf. WANSINK 1981, 24–25, 32–33.

138 WIJNNE 1888, 31–34; *Resolutiën*, 116. Meinardus Schotanus (1593–1644), brother of Bernard Schotanus, studied theology in Franeker. He was professor of theology at Franeker University from 1626 (NNBW: 1620) till 1632, and again from early 1636 till he accepted the call to Utrecht. In 1636, still in Franeker, he graduated in theology. *Album Prom. Acad. Fran.*, 25; BURMAN 1738, 347–348; BOELES 1878–1889, II, 131–135; NNBW, IX, 1000–1001; NAUTA 1980. Bibliography: POSTMA 1980.

139 *Resolutiën*, 135. Carolus Dematius, or De Maets (1597–1651), studied theology in Franeker and abroad, among other places in Sedan. Before his appointment in 1639, he was minister at Scherpenisse and Middelburg. The day after his inaugural oration (2/12 June), Dematius was created *Doctor Theologiae* by Voetius. BURMAN 1738, 203–208; NNBW, VIII, 1094; BLGNP, II, 314–315; *Album Prom. Rhen.-Traj.*, 1.

140 *Resolutiën*, 206, 207, 208, 209. Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617–1666) studied in Leiden and Utrecht, where he graduated in theology in 1643. BURMAN 1738, 147–155; NNBW, VIII, 848–849; BLGNP, II, 259–261.

141 On Further Reformation, see BRIENEN 1986 and VAN LIEBURG 1989. Cf. ISRAEL 1995, 474–477,

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

was consulted even in matters that did not regard the Faculty of Theology.

Just like the Theological Faculty, the Faculty of Law had three chairs. Cyprianus Regneri ab Oosterga¹⁴² succeeded Bernardus Schotanus when the latter accepted an invitation of Leiden University in March 1641. Henrick Moreelse¹⁴³ accepted the third chair in 1644. The medical professor Stratenus had to wait till 1638 before he got assistance. His new colleague was Henricus Regius, professor *extra ordinem* (associate professor) in theoretical medicine and botany (full professor in March 1639).¹⁴⁴ In 1646, Stratenus became the personal physician of the Stadholder Frederik Hendrik (1584–1647), and his frequent absence necessitated the appointment of Diemerbroeck in 1649.¹⁴⁵

The Faculty of Arts, responsible for the preliminary studies to the higher Faculties of Theology, Medicine and Law, had the most students, and consequently a larger staff. To replace Schoock and Van Goor, both leaving in 1638, and most notably Reneri (†1639), Senguerd became full professor in 1638, and Daniel Berckringer¹⁴⁶ took up moral philosophy in March 1640. The next year the Vroedschap appointed *extra ordinem* Jacobus Ravensberger¹⁴⁷ and Paulus Voet¹⁴⁸, the former in mathematics but in 1644 also in philosophy (full), the latter, Voetius' eldest son, in metaphysics (full professor in 1644), with additional lectures in Greek. Finally, Regius, at his own request, received permission to lecture on physics in 1640.¹⁴⁹

690–699.

142 *Resolutiën*, 145–146.

143 *Acta*, 202; *Resolutiën*, 203–204. Henrick Moreelse (1615–1666), studied subsequently in Harderwijk, Utrecht and Leiden. His study tour in France brought him to Bourges, where he graduated in law. Before his appointment at the university, he was alderman (*schepen*) in his native city Utrecht. In 1652, he resigned from the university, and became member of the Utrecht Court of Justice. In 1661, he entered the Vroedschap and was elected Burgomaster from 1662 till 1664. BURMAN 1738, 231–234; NNBW, II, 941.

144 *Resolutiën*, 127, 132.

145 WIJNNE 1888, 67; *Resolutiën*, 248, 262. Ysbrand van Diemerbroeck (1609–1674) studied in Leiden and in France. In 1634, he graduated in philosophy and medicine in Angers. His medical dedication during the outbreak of plague in Nijmegen in 1635, yielded him the appointment as town physician. His being a Remonstrant did not interfere with his appointment in Utrecht (in 1649 *extra ordinem*, full professor in 1651). His major works are *De peste libri iv* (Arnhem: J. Iacobus, 1646), *Anatome corporis humani* (Utrecht 1672), and *Opera omnia anatomica et medica* (Utrecht: M. van Dreunen and G. van Walcheren, 1685). BURMAN 1738, 87–89; NNBW, III, 287–288; LINDEBOOM 1984, 440–442.

146 *Resolutiën*, 136–137, 139. Before his appointment at Utrecht University, Daniel Berckringer (1598–1667) was governor at the Bohemian Court in The Hague. He received his doctoral degree in philosophy — necessary for lecturing at university — from the University of Groningen in April 1640 (the note to the entry in the *Album, sine strepitu et pompa*, is wrongly interpreted as ‘without being present’; the graduation was probably private. Cf. *Album Stud. Acad. Gron.*, 446). In 1648, he started lecturing in eloquence as well. BURMAN 1738, 24–25; VAN DER AA, I, 110; DIBON 1954, 206–210.

147 WIJNNE 1888, 52; *Resolutiën*, 145, 146, 194; *Acta*, 179–180. Jacobus Ravensbergh, Ravensperger or Ravensberger (1615–1650), studied in Groningen, where he graduated in philosophy in 1639. BURMAN 1738, 281–285; NNBW, II, 1169; DIBON 1954, 211–214.

148 *Resolutiën*, 154, 208–209; *Acta*, 202.

149 See my commentary on R/D 12 below.

Introductory Notes

The philosophical climate in the Arts Faculty was pre-dominantly Aristotelian, but it left room for the discussion of new ideas. Reneri offered the usual Aristotelian curriculum in physics, but being influenced by Bacon and probing Descartes' *Essais* with his students, he should best be described as an eclectic.¹⁵⁰ Ravensberger publicly discussed the works of Copernicus and Galileo, and even refers to Descartes, but he and Reneri sought to be delicate, whereas Regius was less scrupulous in his disputations and lectures. Regius' radicalism dismayed even Ravensberger, perhaps for the justified fear that it would spoil any chance to air new opinions at all. Indeed, the Utrecht crisis provoked by Regius and fuelled by Descartes himself, induced the stipulation in the university's statutes (1643) that Aristotelian philosophy and Aristotelian philosophy alone was to be taught within the walls of the Utrecht Academy.¹⁵¹

2.1. Disputations

Next to public and private lectures, disputations played an important role in the academic curriculum.¹⁵² There are, generally speaking, two kinds of disputations. First, disputations *pro gradu*, submitted in order to obtain a doctoral degree, and second, disputations *exercitii gratia*, to practice the skills of students. These disputations differed qua form and authorship. Ordinary disputations were submitted *sub praeside* of the student's professor, who drew up the texts, whether or not in consultation with the *respondens*, but the professor was in any case responsible for its contents.¹⁵³ In case of disputations

150 Cf. SASSEN 1941; DIBON 1954, 197–202; DIBON 1990, 206–218; VERBEEK 1993C. A letter by Saumaise reveals that Reneri examined Descartes' *Essais* at the university (cf. AT X 556–557). For the reception of Bacon's works in the Netherlands between 1620 and 1650, see DIBON 1990, 191–220.

151 *Resolutiën*, 173, 198. The effect of the ban on the New Philosophy did not last very long. During the 1640s, Cartesian physics remained a topic of public debate — Johannes de Bruyn (1620–1675), for example, defended the Cartesian explanation of the tides in his dissertation (DE BRUYN 1644). In the 1650s, Cartesian philosophy had become a normal part of university routine, especially after the appointment of De Bruyn in 1652 (*Resolutiën*, 274; cf. DIBON 1954, 212–216; VERBEEK 1992A, 87–88). The 'Utrecht crisis' is the subject of numerous studies and articles, but few authors offer a more or less complete picture, among whom DUKER 1861, DUKER 1989, II, DE VRIJER 1917, MCGAHAGAN 1976, 153–204. These studies are superseded by *Querelle* and VERBEEK 1992A. For the philosophical issues at stake, see VAN RULER 1995.

152 For the phenomenon of academic disputations, see DIBON 1954, 33–49, AHSMANN 1990, 274–341, and TREVISANI 1992, 45–53. For an outline of the situation at Utrecht University between 1636 and 1815, see KERNKAMP 1936, 147–170.

153 Students could 'personalise' the theses by adding corollaries. If a student was allowed to compose the text himself, such is usually indicated on the title page (by the note 'auctor et respondens' or similar expressions). The *praeses* would nevertheless still be responsible. Ahsmann points out that, over the years 1575–1630, it was common practice in the Faculty of law of Leiden University that students formulated the texts themselves, without this being stipulated on the title page (AHSMANN 1990, 311–323). It needs to be examined if this conclusion is also true for the other faculties or other universities. Disputations that were part of a series, the collection of which was afterwards published under the name of the *praeses*, were always the intellectual work of the professor (AHSMANN 1990, 323). In the early years of Utrecht University, this kind of disputation was the most common one in the Faculties of Arts, Medicine and Theology (for example, REGIUS 1641A and REGIUS 1641B).

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

pro gradu, the candidate had to defend the theses, which he had formulated himself, without the aid of his *promotor*.

Because no records were held of the Senate's meetings during the first five years, we have no detailed description of the rules on disputations in Utrecht.¹⁵⁴ In later years, however, the subject recurred in the *acta* of the Senate and in the resolutions of the Vroedschap, which provide us with the following picture. Disputations *pro gradu* took place in the choir of the Domchurch, in public and *sine praeside*. These inaugural disputations would begin at nine o'clock sharp, and last till ten or a quarter past ten. Students would take care of the first round of opposition, followed by the graduates. Those in whose faculty the graduation took place, had the priority.¹⁵⁵ Disputations *sub praeside* would be submitted in one of the auditoria. Theological disputations were scheduled on Saturdays, juridical and medical disputations on Wednesdays, and philosophical disputations took place on Wednesdays or Saturdays. There were to be no two disputations at the same time, unless they were juridical and medical. Disputations should be announced two weeks in advance to the rector. Of each disputation 200 copies were printed; the printer should distribute 130 among the students, the *praeses* received 20 copies, the respondent 30, and the beadle (*pedellus*) delivered the remaining 30 copies to the professors and members of the Vroedschap. The copies should be ready three days in advance, and the registrar would nail the title pages *ad valvas academiae*.¹⁵⁶

Despite regulations on the way disputations should be conducted, they were more often than not a noisy happening. In 1648, the Leiden professor Adriaan Heereboord stated that during a disputation the public should not 'shout, laugh, pull faces, bleat, whistle, stamp, or make fun of the proceedings', which implies that this behaviour was in fact the order of the day.¹⁵⁷ Both the Vroedschap and the Senate tried to counter the mischief by imposing restrictions — for example, no drinking before a disputation — and in 1661 they even decided to place a fence around the respondent's chair to prevent the most serious misconduct.¹⁵⁸

2.2. Academic holidays

Several of Regius' letters to Descartes bear references to an academic holiday, and in some cases these indications enabled me to determine their correct date.¹⁵⁹ In the early years, the university had five holidays: a summer recess ('hondsagen') from 15/25 July

¹⁵⁴ *Resolutiën*, 102.

¹⁵⁵ WIJNNE 1888, 58–59, 64; *Resolutiën*, 160, 174, 220, 241; KERNKAMP 1936–1940, I, 526. Disputations *pro gradu* were supervised by a *moderator*, who would have been either the *promotor* or the rector.

¹⁵⁶ WIJNNE 1888, 58; *Resolutiën*, 220; *Acta*, 177–178.

¹⁵⁷ HEEREBOORD 1648; cited from VERBEEK 1992A, 65.

¹⁵⁸ WIJNNE 1888, 59; *Resolutiën*, 220; *Acta*, 354–355.

¹⁵⁹ R/D 1, R/D 3, R/D 6, R/D 8, and R/D 14.

Introductory Notes

until 15/25 August; an autumn half-term holiday ('vervaertijd') in October; a winter vacation from 24 December/3 January till 1/11 February; an Easter holiday from eight days before till eight days after Easter; and finally Whitsun holiday, which lasted a week from the Thursday before Pentecost. The dates of these vacations were decided upon *ad hoc* by the Utrecht Vroedschap in the years 1634 and 1635, and registered in the minutes.¹⁶⁰ Except for the autumn half-term holiday, there is no indication that changes with respect to date and length of these holidays were made during the years 1636–1650.¹⁶¹

Baillet records that two academic holidays were related to annual fairs in Utrecht.¹⁶² This is indeed true for the summer recess. Since 1614, the annual fair was centered around the feast of St Mary Magdalene (22 July), beginning on 15/25 July till 4/14 August.¹⁶³ The academic summer holiday thus coincided with the start of the fair-festivities. According to Baillet, the Utrecht Alma Mater also paused during a second annual fair in March. There is, however, no evidence for this fair, but even if Baillet is right, it did not affect academic life: the collection of Voetius' disputations (VOETIUS 1648–1669) shows no interruptions for March.¹⁶⁴

3. DESCARTES' WHEREABOUTS 1635–1650

In early 1635 Descartes settled down in Utrecht, probably at the invitation of his intimate friend Reneri, who was appointed professor at the Illustrious School the year before. His presence in Utrecht in March 1635 is attested by a letter of Anna Maria van Schurman.¹⁶⁵ Descartes stayed in Utrecht until early 1636, when he, probably to escape the plague, moved to Leiden where the disease had subsided.¹⁶⁶ In Leiden, he found a publisher for his *Discours de la Méthode*, Jan Maire, and he stayed there to watch over the printing

¹⁶⁰ *Resolutiën*, 71, 73, 75, 76, 77, 82; KERNKAMP 1936, 59, 170. In March 1635, the Vroedschap asked for a regulation of academic vacations, but it failed to occur (*Resolutiën*, 73).

¹⁶¹ In 1634, it was provisionally decided that the autumn half-term holiday would last from Wednesday 29 October/8 November till 5/15 November (*Resolutiën*, 71). In 1636, 1637 and 1638, however, Voetius presided over several disputations during that period (cf. VAN ASSELT/DEKKER 1995, [170]–[172]), and lacking further information, the most plausible explanation is that its date varied every year.

¹⁶² *Vie*, II, 9, 10, 19, 34–35.

¹⁶³ AT II 569. VANDE WATER 1729, III, 843–844. Cf. EVERS 1938.

¹⁶⁴ See also my commentary on R/D 3.

¹⁶⁵ 'Porro nolui te latere nuperrime me invisisse D. de Cartes, magnae, imo inauditae (ut aiunt) eruditionis virum: qui de communi sive recepto litterarum progressu parum magnifice sentire videtur, nihil horum, inquam, quicquam facere ad veram Scientiam; sibi autem aliam viam, qua longe celerius tutiusque eò perveniatur, repertam esse', Van Schurman to André Rivet, Utrecht 18 March (OS?) 1635. In: VAN DER HORST 1984, 282, 283 (DIBON 1971, 116). Descartes' stay in Utrecht is documented in VERBEEK 1993D, 7–8, 21–23. Kramm recorded the oral tradition concerning Descartes' house at the Maliebaan (KRAMM 1874), which probably stems from the Utrecht Cartesian professor Reinier van Mansveld (1638–1671).

¹⁶⁶ For Utrecht, see the following letters: 16 April, 19 May, 1 November, 8 and 11 December 1635 (AT I 316, 320, 332, 596, 601).

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

process.¹⁶⁷ When the book was ready, Descartes went to Alkmaar and then we lose track of him for a year.¹⁶⁸ Perhaps he stayed for a short while in Alkmaar, or he moved directly to the vicinity of Haarlem, where his presence is attested in the middle of 1637.¹⁶⁹ It is certain that by January 1639 he had taken up lodgings in Santpoort, a village just north of Haarlem,¹⁷⁰ and he may have been living there since the summer of 1637. Descartes stayed in Santpoort till April 1640. From May 1640 till March 1641, Descartes lived in Leiden once again.¹⁷¹ In March 1641, the castle of Endegeest became his new residence.¹⁷² In May 1643, he moved to Egmond aan de Hoef.¹⁷³ After a journey to France from June till November 1644, he returned to Egmond, but now settled in Egmond-Binnen, a few kilometers south of Egmond aan de Hoef.¹⁷⁴ Apart from two journeys to France, in 1647 and 1648, Descartes continued to live in this village close to the North Sea till he decided to exchange the Dutch Republic for Sweden. In September 1649, Descartes embarked a ship for Stockholm, where he died on 11 February 1650.

167 Descartes' first letter from Leiden is of 28 March 1636 (AT I 603). The last letter from Leiden with a certain date is of 20 April 1637 (AT I 631).

168 Descartes' letter to Constantijn Huygens of 20 May 1637 is from Alkmaar (AT I 634). In June Descartes returned to Leiden for a short while to distribute the copies of the *Discours* (AT I 380, 639). In early July Descartes is back again in Alkmaar (AT I 641). In the summer of 1637 Descartes made some arrangements for his daughter Fransintgen (1635–1640) and her mother Helena to join him, cf. AT I 393–394; GAUKROGER 1995, 332–333.

169 During his summer leave of 1637, the Leuven professor of medicine Plemp visited Descartes *in praedio circa Harlemum* (AT I 401). Evidence from Descartes' correspondence that he lived near Haarlem is found only in letters of 1638, cf. to Mersenne, [29 June] 1638, AT II 191/CM VII 311; to Mersenne, 23 August 1638, AT II 338/CM VIII 65.

170 Cf. Descartes to Huygens, 29 January 1639, ROTH 1926, 88/AT II 676.

171 Initially with the intention to print his *Meditationes* there (AT III 35–36), but he changed his mind during the summer, and indecisive what to do with the manuscript, he stayed in Leiden (cf. AT III 126–127). Finally, in November 1640, he sent Mersenne the manuscript to have it printed in Paris (AT III 235).

172 Descartes to Mersenne, 31 March 1641, AT III 350/CM X 579–580.

173 Cf. Descartes to Colvius, AT III 647; to Mersenne, AT III 672, CM XII 196 (autograph); to Huygens, ROTH 1926, 199/AT III 815. Baillet, referring to a letter to Picot, relates that Descartes rented a house in Egmond aan de Hoef from 1 May 1643 till 1 May 1644 (*Vie*, II, 199; AT III 616). In the 17th century, the village is commonly called Egmond op de Hoef.

174 Descartes to Huygens, 21 December 1644 (ROTH 1926, 234–235/AT IV 774–775). On just one occasion Descartes specifies he is living in Egmond-Binnen, his usual subscription is simply Egmond (AT IV 390; for a possible identification of the Utrecht advocate to whom the letter is addressed, see my commentary on D/R 34, n. 7).

THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DESCARTES

AND

HENRICUS REGIUS

— |

| —

— |

| —

Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]

[8/] 18 August 1638

Vie, II, 2–3 [A], 7–8 [B] (no. 1).
 AT, II, 305–306 [B] (no. 136).

[A]

[*L.m.*: Lettr. MSS. de Regius.¹] [...] il [Regius] était revenu dans le lieu de sa naissance vers le temps auquel M. Renery avait été appelé de Deventer pour y professer la Philosophie.² [*L.m.*: Item instrum. Acad. Ultraject.³] Il s’y était procuré même une espèce d’établissement par un mariage, qui ne l’empêcha pas de hanter
 5 M. Renery avec l’assiduité d’un écolier, depuis qu’il eût goûté, et qu’il eût reconnu son mérite.⁴ L’amitié étroite qu’ils lièrent ensemble fut suivie d’une confiance entière que M. de Roy eût en M. Renery. Celui-ci s’en servit avantageusement pour le dégager insensiblement de ses préjugés, et il lui communiqua cette méthode
 10 excellente qu’il avait reçu de M. Descartes pour conduire sa raison dans la recherche de toutes sortes de vérités. M. de Roy [...] ne borna point sa reconnaissance à M. Renery; mais il la fit remonter jusqu’à M. Descartes, pour lequel il conçut dès lors une haute estime, accompagnée d’une vénération profonde. Ce n’étaient encore jusque-là que les fruits de leurs conversations.⁵ Le livre de M. Descartes vint ensuite à paraître.⁶ M. Regius fut des plus ardents à le lire, et l’estime qu’il avait conçu

-
- 1 Although Baillet refers to multiple letters by Regius, his main source for text A is R/D 1. See my commentary.
- 2 Since 1631, Renery taught philosophy at the Illustrious School in Deventer, but on 18/28 January 1634, he signed a contract with the Utrecht magistrates. Sometime after Easter 1634, he moved to Utrecht and went to live in ‘Oudmunstertrans’, a street which is nowadays called ‘Trans’. Cf. *Resolutiën*, 28, 37; DE VRIJER 1917, 17.
- 3 The reference is unclear. It probably refers to *Narratio historica* (NH), the official account by the Academic Senate of the crisis over Cartesianism at Utrecht University, which document is, however, irrelevant to text A.
- 4 Regius married Maria de Swart in Utrecht on 21/31 January 1634. Soon after the marriage, Regius moved from Naarden to Utrecht, and Baillet’s information confirms that he moved into the house in the ‘Oudmunstertrans’ bought by his wife in 1629 (GAU, ‘Transporten en plechten’). For Regius’ studies and occupations before 1634, see my *Regius Chronicle*. Maria de Swart (†1670) came from a Utrecht family connected with magistracy (cf. GRAEVIUS 1679, 15; DE VRIJER 1917, 16–17).
- 5 Renery appears to have been quite an advocate of Descartes in Utrecht. Next to Regius, both Antonius Æmilii and Martin Schoock bear witness to his enthusiastic conversations on Descartes’ philosophy (cf. ÆM/D 5 and my commentary on ÆM/D 5, *Context*; see also note 7 below). But Schoock recalls that it was impossible to meet the philosopher himself; Renery would not reveal Descartes’ whereabouts saying he was a solitary person (SCHOOCK 1643, [III]/*Querelle*, 157–158). Even Regius never met Descartes before 1639, although he stayed in Utrecht in 1635.
- 6 Descartes’ *Discours de la méthode* and the accompanying *Essais*, published in Leiden by J. Maire in 1637 (AT VI). For its detailed commentary, Gilson’s edition (DESCARTES 1930) remains invaluable. Two interesting collections of studies are BELGIOIOSO 1990 and MÉCHOULAN 1988.

15 pour M. Descartes se tourna incontinent en une vraie passion.⁷ Elle lui fit oublier
 peu à peu les considérations qui l'avaient empêché jusqu'à lors de rechercher sa
 connaissance par lui-même, et de lui présenter ses respects immédiatement. Il
 demeura encore près d'un an dans cette réserve, croyant devoir s'étudier à mériter
 l'amitié de ce grand homme, avant que de la lui demander. Non content de s'être
 20 imprimé dans l'esprit les principes de sa nouvelle Philosophie, dont il avait trouvé
 les Essais dans son | livre conformes à ce que Monsieur Reneri lui en avait appris 3
 auparavant, et de les avoir adoptés à la place de ceux qu'on lui avait autrefois
 enseignés dans les Écoles, il se mit en devoir de les digérer encore pour l'usage des
 autres. Il enseignait actuellement la Philosophie, et la Médecine à des particuliers
 25 dans la ville: et pour ne point faire diversion à l'étude particulière qu'il faisait de
 la Philosophie de Monsieur Descartes, il s'avisa de la mettre par cahiers, et de la
 débiter à ses écoliers sous le nom de Physiologie, à mesure qu'il la comprenait.
 [I.m.: Tom. 3 des Lettres de Desc. pag. 4(0)6.⁸ Epist. ad P. Dinetum artic. 15.⁹] La
 simplicité de l'hypothèse, le bel enchaînement des principes et des raisonnements,
 30 la netteté et la facilité avec laquelle il leur en faisait déduire les vérités, les ravit
 de telle sorte, que sans en demeurer aux termes d'une reconnaissance ordinaire
 pour le maître à qui ils étaient si redevables, ils firent une espèce de ligue pour

7 Regius shared this 'passion' for Cartesianism with Reneri. In March 1638, the latter apologised to Marin Mersenne for his silence, as his academic duties left him hardly any time for correspondence (AT II 101–102/CM VII 113–117). In his public lectures he endeavoured to refute the errors of the *philosophia vulgaris*, and he spent his rare free moments on studying Descartes' *Géométrie*, and on observations and experiments. But he confides to Mersenne that he is able to consult Descartes about these matters, whom he therefore calls *mea lux, mea sol* (Reneri had in fact just returned from a five weeks' stay with Descartes, see Reneri's letter to De Wilhem, 28 February 1638, in DIBON 1990, 216–218). Considering the Frenchman as one of the most learned and inspiring men of his time, he cites Virgil's *Erit ille mihi semper Deus* (*Bucolica*, I, 7). Reneri predicts that Descartes' natural philosophy and his method will be the only one accepted among the right-minded.

8 '[...] j'ay receu cete semaine mesme des lettres d'un Docteur [Regius] que je n'ay jamais vû ny connu, et qui neanmoins me remercie fort affectueusement de ce que je l'ay fait devenir Professeur en une université où je n'ay ny amis ny pouvoir; mais j'apprens qu'ayant enseigné en particulier quelque chose de ce que j'ay fait imprimer à des escoliers de ce lieu-là, ils y ont pris tel goust qu'ils ont tous prié le magistrat de leur donner ce professeur', Descartes to Mersenne, 23 August 1638, in: CLE III 406 (*Vie* accidentally gives pagenummer 46), AT II 334/CM VIII 62 (autograph). Descartes' remark that he has no friends at Utrecht University, is beside the truth (see my commentary on Regius' appointment).

9 'Doctor quidam Medicinae, vir acerrimi ac perspicacissimi ingenii [Regius] [...] legit Dioptricam meam et Meteora, cum primum edita sunt in lucem, ac statim aliqua in iis verioris Philosophiae principia contineri judicavit. Quae colligendo diligentius, et alia ex iis deducendo, ea fuit sagacitate, ut intra paucos menses integram inde Physiologiam concinnarit, quae, cum privatim a nonnullis visa esset, eis sic placuit, ut Professionem Medicinae, ibi tunc forte vacantem, pro illo, qui antea ipsam non ambiebat, a Magistratu petierint et impetrarint', *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, AT VII 582–583 (Baillet refers to DESCARTES 1673). Two points need comment. First, Descartes is mistaken about the vacancy of the chair; it was in fact newly created. Second, Descartes' claim that by 1638 Regius had completed his *Physiologia*, is exaggerated. As is evident from R/D 6B, ll. 1–3, Regius was still working on it in the spring of 1639. It is not certain that Regius mentioned his project of a Cartesian workbook in R/D 1, as any reference to it is absent in text B. Baillet's statement that the *Physiologia* received an approbation by the magistrates is in any case false (*Vie*, II, 6).

coopérer à son avancement, et pour s'employer à le faire mettre en place, soit dans le Conseil de Ville, soit dans l'Université.

[B]

Il [Regius] crut avoir toute l'obligation du succès de cette affaire à M. Descartes, dont la philosophie avait formé en lui ce mérite qui l'avait fait préférer aux autres concurrents.¹⁰ La place qu'il occupait lui donnant un degré de hardiesse plus qu'il n'avait auparavant, il se défit du scrupule qui l'avait empêché jusque-là de lui écrire en droiture pour lui présenter ses respects.¹¹ Afin de ne pas rendre sa modestie ou sa timidité suspecte d'ingratitude, il prit la liberté de lui écrire le XVIII d'Août [*i.m.*: Lettre I de Regius MS.] pour le remercier d'un service qu'il lui avait rendu sans le savoir. Il lui demanda la grâce d'être reçu au nombre de ses serviteurs, avantage qu'il avait recherché et qu'il croyait avoir mérité depuis qu'il s'était rendu son disciple. Et pour ne lui point faire un mystère d'une chose qu'il ne pouvait savoir, c'est-à-dire de la manière dont il prétendait que M. Descartes l'avait fait Professeur dans l'Université, il lui fit un détail de la connaissance qu'il avait acquise de sa méthode et de sa philosophie, premièrement par la bouche de M. Reneri, qui l'avait amplement informé des qualités héroïques de son esprit, et ensuite par la lecture des Essais qu'il avait publiés l'année précédente.¹² Il lui marqua ensuite comment il s'était heureusement servi de cette méthode pour enseigner sa philosophie à quelques particuliers suivant ses principes; et il lui apprit que le grand succès de cette entreprise avait porté les Magistrats de la ville et les Professeurs de l'Université à le choisir pour remplir la chaire de nouvelle érection.¹³ Il le conjura de ne point abandonner *son propre ouvrage*,¹⁴ et de ne point lui refuser les assistances nécessaires pour soutenir cette première réputation. Il lui protesta que de son côté il ferait tout ce qui dépendrait de lui pour ne rien faire qui fût indigne de la qualité de son disciple qu'il préférerait à tous les autres avantages de sa vie; et qu'il suivrait les pas de M. Reneri le plus près qu'il lui serait possible.

¹⁰ Regius was appointed professor *extra ordinem* of theoretical medicine on 11/21 July 1638, at a salary of 400 guilders a year, on condition that on top of four lectures a week he would teach botany during the summer as well. His inauguration took place on 6/16 September 1638 (*Resolutiën*, 127–128). NH relates that besides Regius two other candidates were recommended (NH, 9–10/*Querelle*, 84). Their names are not mentioned specifically, but one of them may be Antonius Deusing (1612–1666), who afterwards became professor of physics and mathematics in Harderwijk, and in 1646 professor of medicine at Groningen University (cf. *Querelle*, 462, n. 12; NNBW, VIII, 383).

¹¹ Cf. text A, ll. 17–19.

¹² Cf. text A, ll. 6–15 and R/D 3, ll. 8–9.

¹³ Cf. text A, ll. 24–25.

¹⁴ What is meant here is not Descartes' own work but Regius himself, insofar as he owed his appointment to his being a Cartesian.

25 Pour se mettre d'abord en possession des droits attachés | à cette qualité, il 8
 prit la liberté de lui envoyer ses *Essais de Médecine*, qui n'étaient autre chose
 que des notes assez courtes sur Trincavel, et le pria de les examiner avec toute
 la sévérité d'un maître.¹⁵ Il passa même, appuyé sur l'expérience que M. Reneri
 lui avait donnée de ses bontés, jusqu'à lui demander les objections qui lui avaient
 30 été faites depuis peu contre *la circulation du sang*, avec les réponses qu'il y avait
 données.¹⁶ Et pour lui faire voir jusqu'où pourrait aller la confiance avec laquelle
 il voulait lui abandonner son esprit comme son cœur, il lui dit nettement qu'il ne
 lui viendrait aucune difficulté qu'il ne lui proposât, et dont il n'espérât de lui les
 solutions, comme d'un homme à qui il prétendait tout devoir, et qu'il regardait
 35 comme extraordinairement suscité pour conduire la raison des autres hommes, et
 les tirer de leurs anciennes erreurs.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 18 August 1638, without indication of the calendar used. Descartes, however, mentions Regius' letter in his letter to Mersenne of 23 August 1638, which rules out that it can date from 18 [28] August.¹⁷ The exact date of the letter is therefore [8/] 18 August 1638.

Text

Two passages in Baillet's *Vie* constitute our knowledge of R/D 1. The selection of text B is straightforward, as Baillet clearly indicates he is discussing Regius' first letter

15 Victorius Trincavellius (1496–1568) studied in Padua and in Bologna, where he graduated. After his studies, he returned to his native city Venice, where he took a chair in philosophy and became a well-known physician. In 1551, he was appointed professor of medicine at Padua University. He was the first to study Hippocrates in the original Greek language, and approached the art of medicine without prejudice or superstition. Next to numerous editions of classical authors and commentaries on Galen, he published about nearly every branch of medicine. BLA, IV, 637. According to Graevius (GRAEVIUS 1679, 16), Regius started his lessons at the university by lecturing on Johannes Heurnius' *Institutiones medicinae* (Leiden: ex off. Plantiniana ap. F. Raphelengium, 1592; J. Maire, 1627⁵).

16 Reference to the dispute between Descartes and the professor of medicine in Leuven, Vopiscus Fortunatus Plempius. In early 1638, Plemp brought forward several objections to Descartes' defense of the circulation of the blood and his explanation of the heartbeat, resulting in a short exchange of letters. Descartes failed to convince Plemp of his theory of the heartbeat, but the Leuven professor eventually accepted the circulation of the blood, be it along Harveyan lines. Regius indeed received Plemp's objections and Descartes' replies (see R/D 11B). Regius also possessed copies of Descartes' replies to the Leuven professor of theology, Libertus Fromondus or Froidmont (1587–1653), which he probably received together with the correspondence with Plemp (Descartes to Plemp for Fromondus, 3 October 1637, AT I 412–430; cf. *Physiologia* VI, 98 (Appendix, 245, ll. 26–27)). Descartes' correspondence with Plemp is analysed in FRENCH 1989, 73–81 and GRENE 1993.

17 CM VIII 62/AT II 334. The relevant passage is cited in R/D 1, n. 8.

to Descartes. Text A, however, is at first sight tied to the correspondence only by a non-specific reference in the text's margin to Regius' letters (l. 1). The text is not in AT, probably because there are no clear allusions to the correspondence in the main text. Nevertheless, text A is a source of information on R/D 1. In text B, Baillet mentions several subjects raised by Regius in R/D 1 without going into much detail. The reason seems to be that he already developed these themes earlier in his *Vie*, that is, in text A. The subjects in question are, first, how Regius came to know Reneri and made himself acquainted with the New Philosophy (A: 'il était revenu ... passion', ll. 1–15; B: 'il lui fit ... précédente', ll. 12–15; cf. R/D 3, ll. 8–9). Second, Regius' hesitations about contacting Descartes personally (A: 'Elle ... demander', ll. 15–19; B: 'il se défit ... respects', ll. 4–5). And finally, that Regius initiated his pupils to the principles of Cartesianism. His pupils subsequently urged the magistrates to appoint him professor at the university (A: 'Non ... l'Université', ll. 19–34; B: 'Il lui marqua ... érection', ll. 15–20). Although Baillet does not say which letters exactly he uses in text A, the parallels between A and B strongly suggest that R/D 1 is his main source.

Context

1. The first contact between Descartes and Regius

Baillet expatiates upon the circumstances of the first contacts between Descartes and Regius, but he is basically wrong. Information to correct Baillet's report became available with Roth's publication in 1926 of the Descartes–Huygens correspondence. Because Baillet's story is still the prevailing view,¹⁸ I first summarise his account before turning to a letter published by Roth.

According to Baillet (*Vie*, II, 7–10), Reneri visited Descartes in early August 1638. He informed Descartes of the foundation of a second chair in Medicine at the University of Utrecht, and told him that Regius, the chair's intended candidate, was a professed follower of his philosophy. Back in Utrecht, Reneri informed Regius that Descartes would be pleased to meet him. However, as Regius lacked the opportunity to visit Descartes straightaway — the academic holiday during the summer fair had come to an end — he addressed himself to the French philosopher by letter. As indicated by Baillet, Descartes received this letter on 20 August, as part of a package sent by Reneri, and he immediately wrote back to both Regius and Reneri. He congratulated the latter on the successful introduction of his philosophy at Utrecht University, and allowed him to take Regius with him on his next visit. Reneri, however, became seriously ill and was unable to introduce Regius personally to Descartes, and that induced Regius to write a second letter (R/D 3) asking Descartes' permission to visit him on his own.

Baillet's report needs to be revised in the light of an autograph letter to Huygens published by Roth. The autograph is interesting for two things. First, it reveals the date of the letter, 19 August 1638, and second, it has a few extra lines not previously published in CLE: 'J'avois escrit ce qui precede lors que Mr Renery arrive icy ...' (ROTH 1926, 84/AT II 672; cf. AT II 348–352). When he copied out the draft, Descartes

¹⁸ SASSEN 1941, 42–43; RODIS-LEWIS 1995, 135–136.

added the passage, because Reneri brought back a package, which three months earlier Descartes himself had sent via Reneri to Alphonse Pollot, a friend of both Descartes and Huygens.¹⁹ However, Pollot being captured by the Spanish near Kallo (near Antwerp) in June, the package came back undelivered and was returned to Descartes by Reneri on the 19th of August. Descartes explains the situation to Huygens and sends him the package, to be forwarded to Pollot as soon as he is released.²⁰

This information enables us to correct Baillet's version on several points. First, Baillet is mistaken about Reneri's visit in early August: the autograph reveals that Reneri arrived in Santpoort on 19 August.²¹ Next, Regius' letter to Descartes was not sent by mail, but was personally delivered by Reneri.²² Baillet's claim that Regius' letter arrived in Santpoort on 20 August can also be discarded. Believing that it was sent *by mail* on the 18th, Baillet guessed that it took two days for the letter to travel from Utrecht to Santpoort. Further, if Reneri was able to come and see Descartes on 19 August, Baillet's statement that Regius could not come because the summer vacation had ended cannot hold, for Regius and Reneri taught at the same university. Indeed, term would not begin before 15/25 August.²³ Finally, Descartes' letter to Reneri mentioned by Baillet probably never existed because Reneri was with Descartes.²⁴

2. Regius' appointment at the University of Utrecht

When the academic senate discussed the erection of a second chair in medicine, Reneri pushed Regius forward as a candidate (NH, 9–11/*Querelle*, 83–85). Regius won the support of Liraeus and of the rector, Bernardus Schotanus, whom he knew from his student days in Franeker. For a moment, rumour of Regius' heterodoxy in religious matters threatened his chances. Alarmed, Schotanus and Liraeus consulted Voetius, who then accompanied Liraeus to confront Regius with the accusation. The latter assured them of his orthodoxy, and proved it by showing a certificate to that effect by the Reformed Church Council of Naarden.²⁵ This satisfied Liraeus and Voetius, and paved the way for Regius' appointment.

¹⁹ The package contained Descartes' reply to 15 questions Pollot put to him after reading the *Discours* (AT II 34–46), and possibly a special copy of Descartes' *Géométrie* (AT I 518). Cf. AT II 673 and 728 (note to AT II 34).

²⁰ Huygens already knew Pollot had been taken prisoner. In a letter of 24 June 1638 to the Princess of Orange, Amalia van Solms (1602–1675), he listed Pollot among the prisoners of war she knew personally (HUYGENS 1911–1917, II, 369). In June 1638, the Dutch army attempted to capture the forts on the Scheldt near Antwerp. After a successful start, the campaign ended in disaster. The Spanish troops recaptured the fortress of Kallo on 21 June, taking over 2200 prisoners of war. The majority were still in captivity towards the end of January 1639. See HUYGENS 1911–1917, II, 363, 366–369, 373; TEN RAA/DE BAS 1911–1964, IV, 101–106; ISRAEL 1995, 536.

²¹ Baillet's source of Reneri's visit is Descartes' letter to Mersenne of 23 August 1638, which does not specify the exact date of the visit (cf. AT II 330–331/CM VIII 58–59, and *Vie*, II, 10).

²² The only possible source for Baillet's knowledge of the package in question is R/D 1. Perhaps Reneri had allowed Regius to read Descartes' replies to Pollot.

²³ See our introductory note on Utrecht University.

²⁴ It is difficult to see what induced Baillet to believe Descartes did write to Reneri. Perhaps he simply assumed that since Reneri had sent Descartes a package, the latter would have been obliged to answer.

²⁵ In 1631, being rector of the Latin school in Naarden, Regius had to take the formal pledge of adhering to the confessional basis of the Dutch Reformed Church, which he initially refused. Regius' obtrusive behaviour towards the Naarden Church Council and the Classis of Amsterdam, resulted in an accusation of

NH does not reveal why Regius was preferred to his competitors. But in his letter to Descartes Regius leaves no room for doubt: he owed his appointment at the university to his knowledge of the New Philosophy. According to Regius, his teaching of the New Philosophy to his pupils proved to be a great success, which did not escape the magistrates. Regius' report is surely onesided, and contradicts NH, which stipulates that Regius actually promised not to deviate from traditional medicine (NH, 10/*Querelle*, 84). Still, a testimony by Johannes de Raey, who defended several disputations under Regius in 1641 and became a leading Cartesian philosopher in the Netherlands, suggests that Regius' appointment did have a Cartesian ring. In 1661, De Raey told a visiting Danish student that Regius owed his professoriate to two of Descartes' friends.²⁶ The first friend is without any doubt Reneri. The other one is probably Gijsbert van der Hoolck, one of Descartes' most influential friends in Utrecht. Burgomaster and *curator* from 1634 till 1639 and again in 1641–1642, he was the key figure in academic affairs. Nothing would be decided upon without his consent. Moreover, during the Utrecht crisis he showed himself a supporter and protector of Regius and Descartes. If Van der Hoolck is indeed the second friend referred to by De Raey, it is likely that Regius' enthusiasm for Descartes' philosophy yielded him the Burgomaster's support.

Socialism and Arminianism. Only at the very last moment Regius backed down and signed the Reformed Act of Faith. Upon moving to Utrecht, he received an attestation of Orthodoxy from the Church Council of Naarden. See my *Regius Chronicle*, and DE VRIJER 1917, 9–15; DIBON 1990, 633–634. The records concerning the Classis of Amsterdam are published in DE VRIJER 1917, Appendix II.

²⁶ '[...] Regium Naerdæ primum Rectorem per duos Cartesij amicos ad Ultrajectensem Professionem fuisse promotum', BORRICHUS 1983, I, 43. The Danish student also recorded what De Raey had to say about Regius' religious views: 'Regium fuisse diu Socinianum, jam videri esse Atheum'. After the rupture between Descartes and Regius in 1646, De Raey turned against Regius, saying 'that it is easier to attain salvation with Voetius than with Regius'. In 1687, he stated that 'before Spinoza, some of whose errors he shared, Regius corrupted philosophy' (DE RAEY 1692, 666; the translation is Verbeek's (VERBEEK 1992A, 73)).

Descartes [Santpoort] to Regius
[between 19 and 23 August 1638]

Vie, II, 8 [A, B], 10 [C].

[A]

Le plaisir que lui [Descartes] donnèrent ces beaux effets de sa Philosophie ne lui permit pas de différer de répondre à ses civilités, et de lui accorder son amitié avec tous les fruits qu'elle pourrait produire.

[B] = R/D 3, II. 2–3

« [...] la lettre admirable que vous [Descartes] me fîtes l'honneur de m'écrire *au mois d'Août dernier*. »

[C]

M. Descartes ayant répondu civilement à cette lettre [R/D 1] ...

COMMENTARY

Date

In R/D 3 (II. 2–3) Regius refers back to Descartes' letter he received shortly after sending R/D 1: 'la lettre admirable que vous me fîtes l'honneur de m'écrire *au mois d'août dernier*'.¹ The actual date of the letter cannot be specified, but it is likely that Renieri who forwarded R/D 1 to Descartes, also conveyed Descartes' reply to Regius when he returned to Utrecht. The letter is therefore written between Renieri's arrival in Santpoort on August 19, and August 23, when Descartes wrote Mersenne that Renieri had visited him.²

¹ The italics are Baillet's. Whenever Baillet uses italics in a quotation it does not mean it concerns an addition — these are always put between brackets — but he wants to emphasize the words that support the point he wishes to make. Baillet probably stressed the particular words in R/D 3 in support of his claim that Descartes wrote to Regius in August 1638.

² Descartes to Huygens, 19 August 1638, ROTH 1926, 84/AT II 672; Descartes to Mersenne, 23 August 1638, AT II 330–331/CM VIII 58–59. Renieri had to be back in Utrecht on 15/25 August, the start of a new term at the university.

Text

The letter is not published in CLE, nor does Baillet seem to have had access to it. The biographer's only source is probably R/D 3. D/R 2 is not listed separately in AT, but Regius' reference to Descartes' letter in R/D 3 prompted Adam and Tannery to correct their initial view that Descartes did not personally reply to Regius' first letter (AT II 527, n. a). AM does not go beyond that, probably for want of anything substantial on the letter (AM III, 27, 198). In RL any reference to Descartes' first letter to Regius is absent.

Bordoli (B, 74) is the first to include D/R 2 in the correspondence, borrowing both date and text from a letter by Descartes to Reneri of 20 August 1639 (AT II 307, quoting from *Vie*, II, 8). This may seem justifiable, as Baillet explicitly states that Descartes wrote to Regius and Reneri at the same time.³ However, the letter to Reneri probably never existed (see my commentary on R/D 1, *Context*, 1), and little is therefore gained by presenting Baillet's mistaken account as D/R 2.

The present edition gives all three references to D/R 2 in Baillet's *Vie*. Text B, a fragment from R/D 3, is the most reliable proof of its existence, and, as I remarked, probably Baillet's only source.

Contents

In response to Regius' first letter, Descartes informs him that he is glad to offer him his services. He allows Regius to accompany Reneri on his next visit (cf. R/D 3, ll. 11–16), and without a doubt wishes Regius success in his new position as professor at the University of Utrecht.

³ In continuation of D/R 2A, Baillet writes 'Il récrivit en même temps à M. Reneri ...' (*Vie*, II, 8).

Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]

[early February 1639]

Vie, II, 8–9 (no. [2]).
 AT, II, 527 (no. 158).

« Je n'ai point de termes [...] pour exprimer la joie que m'a donnée
 la lettre admirable que vous me fîtes l'honneur de m'écrire *au mois
 d'Août dernier*.¹ Elle a tellement augmenté le peu de réputation dont
 j'étais redevable d'ailleurs et à vous et à M. Reneri, qu'elle a attiré à mon
 5 école | non seulement plusieurs étudiants en médecine, mais même des 9
 philosophes, des jurisconsultes, des théologiens et d'autres auditeurs
 étrangers, pour écouter les leçons publiques et particulières que je fais
 de la médecine suivant les principes de votre philosophie, que j'ai puisés
 dans vos excellents ouvrages, ou appris de la bouche de M. Reneri.² ...
 10 Cela pouvait suffire, ce semble, pour me rehausser le courage, et pour
 me faciliter de plus en plus les voies de la nature.³ Cependant votre
 bonté vous fait faire encore bien d'autres démarches en ma faveur, et au
 lieu que vous m'aviez accordé la grâce de vouloir bien me souffrir à la
 compagnie de M. Reneri toutes les fois qu'il vous rendrait visite, vous
 15 me permettez maintenant de vous aller voir seul à cause de ses fréquentes
 indispositions.⁴ J'espère profiter de ma permission dans cette semaine
 qui finira nos vacances; et si je ne vous suis point à charge, je passerai
 deux ou trois jours près de vous, afin de pouvoir vous consulter sur
 divers desseins que je me suis proposés, etc. »

1 For the italicised phrase, see my commentary on D/R 2, n. 1. R/D 3 and R/D 58 are the only letters which Baillet quotes verbally. Note that both texts are translations from the original Latin.

2 Cf. R/D 1A, ll. 6–15 and R/D 1B, ll. 12–15.

3 'Les voies de la nature', a Baconian expression (*viae naturae*), cf. *Novum organum*, in: BACON 1963, I, 231, 282.

4 This remark may indicate another (lost) letter to Regius, but perhaps Regius obtained permission to visit Descartes via Reneri or another of Descartes' friends in Utrecht. See my commentary.

COMMENTARY

Date

Although Baillet gives 9 March 1639 as the date of the letter — without indication of the calendar used — the letter itself contains information that contradicts Baillet.⁵ Regius announces his intention to visit Descartes ‘dans cette semaine qui finira nos vacances’ (ll. 16–17). According to Baillet (*Vie*, II, 10, 19), the university was closed in March due to an annual fair, but there is no evidence for a fair in March, nor for an academic holiday during that month.⁶ There is in fact proof that the university was not closed in the period in which Regius’ letter is supposed to be written. On 23 February, 9 March, and 12 March 1639 OS Voetius presided over several disputations.⁷ Consequently, the date given by Baillet cannot be correct.⁸

In his letter Regius mentions Reneri’s poor health (ll. 14–16) and the letter thus antedates Reneri’s death on 10/20 March 1639 (cf. R/D 4). As a result, two holidays may be meant in the phrase ‘cette semaine qui finira nos vacances’: autumn half-term holiday or the winter-vacation. The holiday referred to has to be the latter, because it is implied that it lasted longer than one week. The correct date of the letter is therefore c.24 January/3 February 1639.

Baillet does not indicate the number of R/D 3 in the Clerselier collection, but it was probably no. 2. In between the present letter and no. 3 in the Clerselier collection (R/D 6), Baillet mentions another letter (R/D 4), but this particular letter appears not to have been part of the collection (see my commentary on R/D 4).

Context

The main topic of the present letter is Regius’ desire to visit Descartes, which apparently he had not done yet. In August 1638, Descartes allowed Regius to accompany Reneri on his next visit (D/R 2). Reneri being a regular guest of Descartes, the promise will have satisfied Regius for the moment. After several months it became clear to Regius that Reneri would not visit Descartes in the near future, and finally he asked Descartes’ permission to come to Santpoort without Reneri. This was granted by Descartes, probably in January 1639, and the present letter is Regius’ reply.

This course of events can be inferred from Regius’ letter itself: ‘au lieu que vous m’aviez accordé la grâce de vouloir bien me souffrir à la compagnie de M. Reneri, toutes les fois qu’il vous rendrait visite, vous me permettez *maintenant* de vous aller voir seul à cause de ses fréquentes indispositions’ (ll. 12–16, emphasis added). The word ‘maintenant’ implies that Descartes recently gave Regius permission to come to

5 ‘Sa lettre est datée du IX de Mars 1639 et ne pouvant y renvoyer le Lecteur, parce qu’elle n’est pas encore publique, il est à propos de lui en représenter le sens en abrégé pour des raisons dont ont lui laissera ensuite l’examen’, *Vie*, II, 8, immediately followed by the text of R/D 3.

6 See the introductory note on Utrecht University.

7 VOETIUS 1648–1669, I, 442; 489; II, 698. In 1638 and 1640, Voetius held several disputations in late February and early March as well (3, 10 and 17 March 1638 OS, and 29 February, 2, 7 and 14 March 1640 OS; VOETIUS 1648–69, I, 933, II, 902, 922, 943, III, 1227). For a chronological list of the disputations published in VOETIUS 1648–1669, see VAN ASSELT/DEKKER 1995, 193.

8 There is no explanation of Baillet’s mistake, especially because he had the autograph at hand.

Santpoort on his own, as opposed to Descartes' permission in August 1638 to visit him in the company of Reneri. It is not possible to determine whether this permission was granted by a letter now lost, although Regius' specification that Descartes' first letter was written in 'August last year' (ll. 2–3) could be an indication to that effect.

Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]

19/29 March 1639

Vie, II, 20, 21.
AT, II, 528 (no. 159–I).

On lui [Reneri] fit dans la grande église de la ville de splendides funérailles, auxquelles le Sénat ou les Magistrats assistèrent en corps avec l'Université environnée d'une grande multitude de peuple.¹ Le lendemain [*i.m.*: le 18 jour de Mars.] l'on se rassembla pour entendre l'oraison funèbre du défunt. Elle fut prononcée
 5 au nom de l'Université par le sieur Antoine Emilius, Professeur en éloquence et en histoire. On admira la beauté du discours, et on fut touché des réflexions de l'orateur. Mais on s'aperçut bientôt que ce n'était pas moins le panégyrique de
 M. Descartes vivant, que l'oraison funèbre de feu M. Reneri.² [...] | Tout cela se
 10 passa sans la participation de M. Descartes, qui n'apprit la mort de M. Reneri que par une lettre que M. Regius lui en écrivit le lendemain.⁴

COMMENTARY

Date

According to Baillet, Regius wrote to Descartes the day after the funeral oration for Reneri, which took place on 18/28 March 1639. The date of the letter is therefore 19/29 March 1639.

Baillet does not specify the place of the letter in the Clerselier collection, and perhaps it was not part of it. If so, the letter may have been lost in the mail and never reached Descartes. Such was in any case Regius' conclusion, because he did not receive an answer from Descartes. On 17 May 1639, he therefore wrote another letter, in which he partly repeated the contents of his previous letter (see R/D 6).

1 Early March 1639, Reneri fell dangerously ill and his physicians did not expect him to recover anymore (VAN BUCHELL 1940, 86). The general assumption in secondary literature that Reneri died on 15 or 16 March OS, since he was buried on 17 March OS, appears to be incorrect. In the archives of the Dom-chapter (GAU) it is recorded that the death bell rang for Reneri on 10/20 March 1639 (cf. DRAKENBORCH 1895, 146). Hesitantly, Baillet reports that Reneri died during his wedding night (*Vie*, II, 19, relying on an editor's note to a letter of Pierre Gassendi (1592–1655) to Reneri, in: GASSENDI 1658, VI, 31, also cited in AT II 529; the editor mentions Henricus Bornius (see R/D 55B) as his source). The story is evidently false, as already noted in BURMAN 1738, 303, and ROTH 1926, 125. Reneri married his second wife Anna van Velthuysen in Utrecht on 21 October 1638 OS (NNBW, II, 1191).

2 ÆMILIUS 1639. Reprinted in ÆMILIUS 1651, 105–124, 412–413.

3 The passage not printed here constitutes R/D 11A.

4 Descartes already knew Reneri had died. As soon as he heard of Reneri's critical condition, he sped off to Utrecht, only to find out he could not assist him anymore (Descartes to Pollot, 6 May 1639, AT II 545). Baillet does not point out that Regius had been ordained full professor on 18/28 March 1639 (*Resolutiën*, 132), an indication that the biographer did not have the actual letter at hand, as Regius would certainly have mentioned it (see my commentary).

Æmilius to Descartes [Santpoort]

[late March or early April 1639]

Vie, II, 21–22 (no. 9).

AT, III, 2–3 (no. 181–I), II, 528 (no. 159–II).

Il y avait longtemps que M. Emilius cherchait à s'introduire dans la connaissance et la familiarité de M. Descartes. Les habitudes qu'il avait eues autrefois avec M. Beeckman, Principal du Collège de Dort [*i.m.*: Lettr. MS. d'Emil. à Descart. n. IX parmi celles de Regius.], lui avaient découvert une partie de son mérite, et cet homme lui avait inspiré une vénération profonde pour lui.¹ Depuis la mort de M. Beeckman, s'étant lié très étroitement avec M. Reneri, qu'il considérait non seulement comme son collègue, mais encore comme son compatriote à cause du pays de Liège qui leur avait donné la naissance,² il sentit augmenter extraordinairement la passion qu'il avait conçue à Dort³ pour son esprit. La seule conversation de M. Reneri l'avait rendu sectateur de ses opinions et serviteur de sa personne, jusqu'à ce que la lecture des ouvrages même de M. Descartes achevât de faire cette conquête pour la secte de la nouvelle Philosophie. A la mort de cet intime ami, il s'était trouvé d'autant plus honoré de la commission qu'il avait reçue d'en faire l'oraison funèbre [*i.m.*: V. les Lettr. de Reg.⁴ et d'Emil. à Descart.] qu'on avait mieux secondé son inclination sans qu'il eût été obligé de la faire paraître, et sans se rendre par conséquent suspect de flatterie. Mais il bénit surtout la Providence, lorsque le premier Magistrat de la ville lui envoya ordre exprès de faire *les éloges de M. Descartes et de la nouvelle philosophie* dans l'oraison funèbre de M. Reneri.⁵ [*i.m.*: Les termes de *l'unique Archimède de notre siècle, de l'unique Atlas de l'univers, de confident de la nature, de puissant Hercule, d'Ulysse, et*

1 Isaac Beeckman (1588–1637) was a close friend of Æmilius'. They studied together in Leiden (1607–1610) and Saumur (1612). In 1619, Æmilius was appointed rector of the Hieronymus school in Utrecht, where he took on Beeckman as deputy headmaster. After barely two years, Beeckman took up a position at the Latin School at Rotterdam. From 1627 till his death, Beeckman was rector of the Latin School at Dordrecht. NNBW, VII, 84–88. VAN BERKEL 1983. For Descartes and Beeckman, see VAN BERKEL 1983, 292–301 and GAUKROGER 1995, 68–103, 222–224.

2 The towns of Huy (Hoei), where Reneri was born, and Hasselt, Æmilius' birthplace, were part of the prince-bishopric of Liège.

3 Probably during Æmilius' visits to Dordrecht when Beeckman was rector of the Latin School, although we cannot exclude the possibility that Æmilius actually refers back to the time he himself was rector of the same school at Dordrecht from 1615 till November 1619. In the latter case, Beeckman would have told Æmilius of Descartes shortly after he made his acquaintance in November–December 1618.

4 Probably letters 8 and 10 in the Clerselier collection. Cf. R/D 11A and 11C.

5 There is probably some exaggeration in the rumour that the first Burgomaster Van der Hoolck commissioned the tribute to Descartes, but it is equally unlikely that Æmilius prepared the eulogy without his approval.

de Dedale, et plusieurs autres expressions figurées, dont il s'est servi dans son latin, ne lui sont venues qu'au défaut de ce qu'il voulait dire.] Ce qu'il considéra comme une faveur du Ciel, qu'il n'aurait jamais osé espérer quand il aurait eu la pensée de la solliciter. Il n'abusa point d'une occasion si favorable que Dieu lui
 25 présentait pour se produire à M. Descartes, dont on peut dire qu'il mérita l'amitié en s'acquittant simplement d'une obligation qui lui était devenue indispensable par la nécessité d'obéir à ses maîtres légitimes. Aussi n'eut-il pas plutôt prononcé l'oraison funèbre que, non content de lui en faire donner avis par M. Regius, il lui
 30 en envoya une copie manuscrite, avec des lettres pleines de respect et d'estime, sous prétexte que ce discours le regardant personnellement, et qu'ayant reçu ordre du Magistrat de le donner à l'imprimeur de l'Université pour le rendre public, il était à propos qu'il vît ce qu'il y avait à changer avant l'impression.⁶

COMMENTARY

Date

The Clerselier collection of Regius' letters includes one letter to Descartes from Antonius Æmiliius, the professor of history and rhetoric in Utrecht. The funeral oration for Reneri offered Æmiliius a chance to get in touch with 'the one and only Archimedes of our age'. He sent Descartes a manuscript copy of the oration and a letter in which he introduced himself. As Æmiliius wrote to Descartes shortly after the funeral oration (ll. 27–30), which took place on 18/28 March 1639, the letter dates from late March or early April 1639.

Text

In the second volume of his *Vie* Baillet refers three times to Æmiliius' letter, on pages 21 and 22 (ÆM/D 5) and page 57 (see R/D 7C). But Baillet does not give the date of the letter, which suggests he did not know its exact date. He only states the letter was sent shortly after the funeral oration. The letter has the number 9 in the Clerselier collection, between Regius' letters 8 and 10 (R/D 7), which Baillet claims to be written in early 1640. The multiple references to Æmiliius' letter and the ambiguity concerning its date induced Adam and Tannery to assume that Baillet had two different letters by Æmiliius. Adam and Tannery thus list two letters from Æmiliius to Descartes, which are both taken

⁶ In his *Lettre apologétique*, Descartes relates that next to the manuscript copy of Æmiliius' oration and its covering letter he also received a laudatory poem on him and Reneri (AT VIII B 203–204). When Æmiliius asked the poem back to have it printed, Descartes politely refused, considering the displayed admiration out of proportion. Descartes was indeed not too pleased with Æmiliius' public and extravagant praise (see my commentary), but he did consider him a personal friend ever since, even to the extent that he allowed him to read an early version of his *Meditationes* (cf. R/D 12C, R/D 14C and D/R 15). ÆM/D 5 is, however, the only 'extant' letter of their correspondence.

together with a letter from Regius. In AT, *ÆM/D* 5 is split into two parts, combining ‘Aussi n’eut-il pas ... l’impression’ (ll. 27–33) with R/D 4, and ‘Il y avait longtemps ... solliciter’ (ll. 1–24) together with the reference to *Æmilius*’ letter in *Vie*, II, 57 with R/D 7.⁷

The difficulties concerning *Æmilius*’ correspondence are less problematic than Adam and Tannery believe and certainly do not warrant the assumption of there being two letters. First, it is not unusual for Baillet to refer several times to the same letter, without repeating its date and/or number. In the case of *Æmilius*’ letter, the biographer confines himself to supplying a precise reference to the letter a first time only, namely that it is no. 9 in the collection. Second, as regards the place of the letter in the collection between Regius’ letters 8 and 10, a plausible explanation is that they are grouped together because the precise date of all three letters is unknown (see my commentary on R/D 11), and because their common subject is *Æmilius*’ funeral oration. Finally, the decisive factor that we are not dealing with two different letters is that the text itself offers no indication to that effect. On the contrary, when viewed as a whole, including the bridging passage left out in AT (‘Il n’abusa point ... légitimes’, ll. 24–27), there can be little doubt that Baillet is discussing one and the same letter. The topics raised in the first part of the text are more at home in an introductory letter, as Baillet remarks, than in an advanced correspondence, as would be the consequence of the division in AT.

Context

Æmilius’ funeral oration for Reneri

Baillet aptly characterises *Æmilius*’ speech as a panegyric of Descartes rather than a funeral oration for Reneri (R/D 4, ll. 7–8). Indeed, to *Æmilius* Reneri’s most memorable quality seems to have been his friendship with a French nobleman, ‘the Archimedes of our time, René Descartes’. On the pretext of *Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas*,⁸ *Æmilius* defends academic freedom: if one sticks to the mere explanation of traditional philosophy, the philosopher will never leave the schoolroom, and forget his proper task, which is the search for truth. *Æmilius* relates how Reneri wholeheartedly subscribed to the philosopher’s creed, in his philosophical investigations preferring his inspiring guide Descartes over the ancients. Now Descartes is staged, the oration turns into his extravagant praise: ‘you, mighty Atlas, who supports the heavenly firmament, not with raised shoulders, but by the firm reasoning of your magnificent mind’.⁹ In a long passage, Reneri is presented speaking from heaven to Descartes, informing him that in his blessed state he now shares in Descartes’ wisdom.

To Reneri’s personal friends and his students, the tenor of the oration cannot have come as a surprise. Schoock for example, who graduated under Reneri, introduced Descartes to the readers of his anti-Cartesian work recounting how Reneri used to talk

⁷ Respectively Regius and *Æmilius* to Descartes, ‘19 March 1639’, AT II 528–529; Regius and *Æmilius* to Descartes, ‘January 1640’, AT III 1–4.

⁸ Aristotle, *Ethica*, I, 6, 1096a, 16. *ÆMILIUS* 1651, 113.

⁹ ‘... magne Atlas, Cartesi, qui unus fere universum nunc fulcis coelum, non suppositis humeris, sed solidis divini animi rationibus’, *ÆMILIUS* 1651, 119.

about a certain French nobleman, who had developed this wonderful new scientific method and whom Reneri therefore called ‘Prince of philosophers’.¹⁰ The majority of the audience, however, probably had never heard of Descartes before. The comments on Æmilius’ oration by the professor of law Antonius Matthaëus, clearly not a close friend of Reneri’s, reflect the general puzzlement:

Dr. Matthaëus said about the funeral oration for Reneri by Antonius Æmilius, that it indeed mentioned his virtues, but kept silent about his vices, and, moreover, it too highly valued a certain Frenchman Du Chartres [sic], a very ingenious man, who is in the habit of attributing everything to himself while despising others.¹¹

Descartes himself was not too pleased with the attention he received, fearing that it would arouse the wrong kind of attention. Indeed, according to Descartes, it was Æmilius’ oration which prompted Voetius to accuse him of atheism in his disputations later that year. Descartes admits he is not specifically named in the writings of the Utrecht theologian, but ‘[Voetius] y a meslé, parmy les marques de l’atheisme, toutes les choses qu’il sçavoit m’estre attribuées par le bruit commun’.¹² Descartes seems not to have exaggerated. In 1640, Voetius wrote to Mersenne, whom he admired for his work against atheism, imploring his help against Descartes. According to Voetius, some worship Descartes as if he were a new God descended from heaven.¹³ Without any doubt, Æmilius’ performance greatly contributed to Voetius’ unfavorable impression of Cartesianism.

¹⁰ SCHOOCK 1643, [I–IV]/*Querelle*, 157–158.

¹¹ The Utrecht historian Arnold van Buchell, or Buchelius (1565–1641), wrote Matthaëus’ comments down in his notebook: ‘Dicebat Doctor Matheus de orat(ione) fun(ebri), in Mortem D(omini) Renerij habita ab Ant(onio) Æmylio, quod virtutes in eo quidem enarrasset, vitia t(ame)n dissimulasset, tum q(uo)d nimis aestimasset quendam Gallum du Chartres, nimiae subtilitatis virum, qui sibi o(mn)ia tribuere solet cum deprecatione aliorum’, *Notae Quotidianae*, Utrecht University Library, 5 L 25, p. 100 (with some transcription errors published in VAN BUCHELL 1940, 70). For some reason, the entry in his *Notae* is placed between remarks dated July 1638.

¹² *Lettre apologétique aux magistrats d’Utrecht*, AT VIII B 205. Voetius’ disputations *De atheismo* (VOETIUS 1639) were defended on 22 and 29 June, 6 and 13 July 1639 OS. A revised edition of VOETIUS 1639 appeared in VOETIUS 1648–69, I, 114–225, including many explicit references to Descartes. The original disputations have been unearthed by Verbeek, see VERBEEK 1993E.

¹³ ‘Molitur ille vir [Descartes], sed sero nimis, ut opinor, sectam novam, nunquam antehac in rerum natura visam, aut auditam; et sunt qui illum admirantur atque adorant, tamquam novum Deum de coelo lapsum’, Voetius to Mersenne, 27 August 1640 OS, AT VIII B 205–206/CM X 166. For the date of the letter, which is not found in AT or CM, see BOS 1999B, 421.

Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]

17 May 1639

Vie, II, 21 [A], 23 [B], 35 [C], 51–52 [D] (no. 3).
 AT, II, 548 [A], 548–549 [B] (no. 164).

[A] (In continuation of R/D 4)

Il parut même qu'il [Descartes] n'en reçut la nouvelle¹ que plusieurs jours après, lorsque M. Regius, s'étant douté que sa lettre d'avis² avait été perdue, lui récrivit le xvii de Mai 1639.³ [*i.m.*: Lettr. 3 MS. de Regius à Descartes.] Il lui manda de nouveau une partie de ce qui le regardait dans l'oraison de M. Emilius. Il lui
 5 demanda en même temps la permission de l'aller voir à Egmond aux Fêtes de la Pentecôte pour l'informer de ce qui s'était passé, et pour se faire instruire de diverses choses dont il avait besoin.⁴ Enfin il le conjura de vouloir lui donner auprès de lui la place de feu M. Reneri, ajoutant que, s'il la lui accordait, *il s'estimerait aussi heureux que s'il était élevé jusqu'au troisième Ciel*.⁵

[B]

Après s'être assuré des bontés de M. Descartes, il continua le dessein qu'il avait entrepris de renfermer dans des propositions courtes tout ce qu'il croyait savoir touchant la physiologie. Il était presque sur la fin de cet ouvrage, lorsqu'il en écrivit à M. Descartes [*i.m.*: Le 17 Mai 1639.] pour lui communiquer les difficultés qu'il
 5 y trouvait; ayant pris un chemin qui lui paraissait nouveau, et qui pouvait être dangereux à un homme qui n'était pas encore assez expérimenté dans les voies de la nature.⁶ Il le pria par avance [*i.m.*: Lettr. 3 de Reg. à Desc.] de prendre la peine de le revoir quand il l'aurait achevé, et d'user de son droit en y réformant tout ce qu'il jugerait avoir besoin de réforme.⁷

1 *Sc.* Reneri's death on 10/20 March 1639.

2 R/D 4.

3 Cf. R/D 4, n. 4.

4 Pentecost fell on 2/12 June 1639, so the Whitsun holiday lasted from 30 May/9 June till 6/16 June. In 1639, Descartes did not live in Egmond, as Baillet believes, but in Santpoort. See my introductory note on *Descartes' whereabouts 1635–1650*.

5 'Scio hominem [...] raptum eiusmodi usque ad tertium caelum', 2 Cor. 12,2 (Vulgate).

6 For the expression *viae naturae*, see R/D 3, n. 3.

7 See my commentary on R/D 12. For Descartes' comment, see D/R 17.

[C]

Monsieur *Vander-Hoolck* l'un des principaux Magistrats de la ville, avec qui M. Descartes avait de grandes habitudes, et qui protégeait M. Regius pour l'amour de lui dans les relations que l'Université pouvait avoir avec le Sénat ou le Conseil de la ville.⁸ [*l.m.*: Lettr. 3 MS. de Regius à Desc.]

[D]

Il s'agissait d'une gageure fameuse de mathématiques entre deux Hollandais, dont l'un était *Jean Stampioen*, et l'autre *Jacques Waessenaer* le jeune, dont le père était Professeur des mathématiques à Utrecht, et ami intime de M. Descartes.⁹ [*l.m.*: Lettr. 3 de Reg. MS.] Stampioen qui était aussi fils d'un mathématicien à Amsterdam,¹⁰ avait publié dès l'an 1639 un assez gros livre d'algèbre en langue vulgaire du pays, après avoir fatigué le public pendant plusieurs années par de magnifiques promesses, et par des fanfaronnades qui n'avaient produit jusque-là que des affiches, des programmes, et des placards pleins de vanités extravagantes, pour préparer le monde à recevoir son grand ouvrage d'algèbre avec le respect et l'estime qu'il en attendait.¹¹

[...]

Waessenaer était sommé par ces billets de maintenir et démontrer ce qu'il avait écrit contre Stampioen; mais il ne crut pas devoir s'engager à rien avant que de consulter M. Descartes, dont il suivait la méthode et l'analyse géométrique, comme nous l'apprenons de Regius et de Lipstorp. [*l.m.*: Reg. ut supr. [Lettr. 3] et Epist. 6. Listorp. de certitud. Phil. Cart. p. 12 et 13.]

⁸ In *Vie*, text C is part of an enumeration of Descartes' friends in Utrecht. It is not possible to determine why Regius mentioned Van der Hoolck in his letter. If Regius indeed assumed that his previous letter (R/D 4) did not reach Descartes, he will without any doubt have reiterated the decision of the Vroedschap (city council) from 18/28 March 1639 appointing him ordinary professor, and in this context he may have mentioned Van der Hoolck (*Resolutiën*, 132). Contrary to Adam and Tannery's note to R/D 6, on 22 April 1639 OS Regius was not entrusted with lecturing on physics but with instructing the students in the hortus botanicus (WIJNNE 1888, 45; *Resolutiën*, 132). Regius obtained permission to give a course in physics in April 1640 (see my commentary on D/R 12).

⁹ For Jacob van Waessenaer and Johan Stampioen the Younger, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

¹⁰ Jan Jansz. Stampioen, mathematician living in Rotterdam (not Amsterdam). He was appointed land surveyor of the States of Holland in 1621, which office he combined, from 1624 onwards, with that of inspector of weights and measures of Rotterdam. He published a tract on the measurement of latitude, *Nieuwe tafelen der polus-hooghte* (Rotterdam: M. Bastiaensz., 1618). NNBW, II, 1356–1358.

¹¹ The work referred to is Johan Stampioen's *Algebra ofte Nieuwe stel-regel, Waer door alles ghevonden wordt inde Wis-Konst, wat vindtbaer is*, printed at the author's house, *In sphaera mundi*, The Hague, 1639. The privilege is dated 25 March 1639. The so-called Stampioen-affair is outlined in my commentary.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 17 May 1639, without indication of the calendar used.

Text

Texts C and D are not in AT, but as Baillet refers to R/D 6 in the margin of both texts, they are part of the correspondence.

*Context**The Stampioen-affair*

In the spring of 1639, Johan Stampioen the Younger published his *Algebra ofte Nieuwe stel-regel* after an intensive publicity campaign.¹² From the outset, Descartes followed Stampioen's moves Argus-eyed, as the proposed *Algebra* was evidently directed against his own *Géométrie*. In 1638, Stampioen published a broadsheet, in which he challenged Dutch mathematicians to solve two mathematical problems. The challenge was taken up by Descartes' friend in Utrecht, Jacobus van Waessenaer, who solved both questions using Descartes' geometrical method. Stampioen nevertheless pursued the publication of his *Algebra*, which immediately provoked an answer by Van Waessenaer with the aid of Descartes.¹³ In three 'letters of summon' (*Daghvaerdbrieven*) Stampioen challenged his opponent to demonstrate his criticism for a forfeit of 600 guilders, which would benefit the poor should a jury decide that his method was inferior. Van Waessenaer accepted and both parties consigned the wagers to the rector of Leiden University, Nicolas Dedel (1597–1646) in November 1639. In the weeks that followed, anxious discussion took place on the exact formulation of the question at stake. As members of the jury were appointed the Leiden mathematicians Jacob Golius and Frans van Schooten Sr, who were both on friendly terms with Descartes.¹⁴ The original plan was for the jury to consist of four members, but Bernardus Schotanus, professor of law and mathematics in Utrecht, became seriously ill, and Andries van Berlicom (c.1587–1656),¹⁵ secretary of the city of Rotterdam, declined for reasons unknown. Golius and Van Schooten proceeded slowly, much to the annoyance of Descartes. Finally, on 24 May 1640, the jury declared Van Waessenaer the winner, and Stampioen lost his money to the Leiden *Pesthuis* (see D/R 13, ll. 73–79). Triumphantly, Descartes and Van Waessenaer published later that year a dossier on the affair in 'The Ignorance of the Mathematician Stampioen exposed'.¹⁶

12 STAMPIOEN 1639. During the affair, which lasted from 1638 till 1640, Stampioen and Van Waessenaer showered each other with pamphlets. The abundance of material makes the affair a complex one and a comprehensive study is still desired. Attempts to unravel the affair are BIERENS DE HAAN 1887, and BOSMANS 1927, making use of the publication of numerous letters and documents on the affair by Roth (ROTH 1926, 98–128, 264–289/AT II 686–726, III 737–744). See also AM, III, 152–154, THUISSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 74–79.

13 VAN WAESSENAER 1639.

14 For Golius, see the *Biographical Lexicon*. For Van Schooten Sr (c.1581–1645), see NNBW, VII, 1108–1110, and THUISSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 77, 79, 83, 648.

15 NNBW, I, 317–318; VI, 105.

16 VAN WAESSENAER 1640. Descartes' involvement in the publication emerges from his correspondence with

Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]

14 [/24] July 1639

Vie, II, 34–35 (no. 4).
AT, II, 569 (no. 169).

Les exercices finirent peu de jours après cette thèse; et M. Regius écrivant à M. Descartes le quatorzième de Juillet [*i.m.*: Lettre 4 MS. de Reg. à Desc.] qui commençait les vacances, se garda bien de lui mander ce qu’il avait fait à la thèse.¹ Il se contenta de lui faire savoir « qu’il avait achevé son cours public de
5 médecine cette année; qu’il était toujours demeuré fortement attaché à ses principes et à sa méthode; et qu’il souhaitait avec passion de conférer avec lui sur la meilleure manière de faire un nouveau cours l’année suivante, qui commençait après la foire du mois d’Août, selon le règlement de l’Université. »²

10 M. Descartes lui avait fait espérer de l’aller voir en un | voyage qu’il semblait 35 avoir promis de faire à Utrecht au temps de la foire.³

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 14 July 1639, without indication of the calendar used. He does, however, specify that July 14 marked the beginning of the academic summer holiday. Officially the summer recess started on Monday 15/25 July, and the exact date of the letter is therefore 14 [/24] July.

Text

Before turning to R/D 7, Baillet informs his readers of Regius’ presumed misbehaviour during a disputation submitted in July 1639 (*Vie*, II, 34). Contrary to Adam and Tannery, I do not incorporate his account in the selection for R/D 7 from *Vie*, because, as Baillet

4–5 « qu’il avait ... année; qu’il était] qu’il avait ... année; « qu’il était *Vie*.

Huygens and De Wilhem, see ROTH 1926, 137/AT III 753, ROTH 1926, 138/AT III 754, AT III 199–200.

1 Baillet refers to Regius’ alleged misbehaviour during the disputation *pro gradu* of Florentius Schuyf in July 1639. See my commentary.

2 In 1635, the Utrecht Vroedschap decided that the academic summer recess would last from 15/25 July till 15/25 August. See my introductory note on Utrecht University.

3 Apparently, Descartes did not visit Regius during the summer of 1639, because Baillet relates that by September Regius had still not been able to consult him (R/D 8, II. 1–2).

stipulates, Regius does not mention the event in his letter (cf. ll. 1–3). Baillet’s account has, moreover, no surplus value above NH, his only source. On the contrary, the biographer gives the event a turn not found in NH, and which is consequently his own interpretation (see below).

Context

Florentius Schuyt’s disputation pro gradu

According to NH, the first signs of the pending crisis over the New Philosophy at Utrecht University, surfaced in July 1639 when Florentius Schuyt⁴ submitted his disputation *pro gradu*.⁵ Apparently, the subject of the disputation was the magnet, the attraction of which Schuyt, having the Aristotelian philosopher Senguerd as his *promotor*, explained in a traditional fashion. NH relates how the graduation ended tumultuously, when an opponent trained in the New Philosophy attacked Schuyt on the magnet’s occult quality of attraction and Regius subsequently rose from his chair proclaiming victory for the opponent — probably one of his own students. Regius thus seriously insulted both Schuyt and Senguerd, and went against the judgement of all professors present that Schuyt had well defended himself against the objections.⁶

As Baillet carefully reminds his readers, the account as presented in NH is a Voetian picture of the event.⁷ In the context of NH it serves as an example of the unrest Cartesianism evoked at the university and its disturbing attraction on students. The account even pinpoints Regius’ offensive propagation of the New Philosophy. What actually happened, and how serious Regius’ ‘misbehaviour’ was cannot be determined, NH being the only source of the event. Regius may just have protested to Senguerd,

4 After his graduation in the Utrecht Faculty of Arts, Florentius Schuyt (1619–1669) studied philosophy and theology in Leiden for a short while, before being appointed professor of philosophy at the Illustrious School at ‘s-Hertogenbosch in 1640. In the 1640s, Schuyt embraced Cartesianism. Eventually he became interested in the philosopher’s posthumous works, and in 1662 he published Descartes’ *Traité de l’homme* in a Latin translation. Although Clerselier claims that his own edition of *Traité de l’homme* in 1664 is based on the French autograph, Schuyt’s re-edition of 1664 is of special interest because it is based on a collation of four different manuscripts. In 1664, Schuyt graduated in medicine and he was immediately appointed professor of medicine in Leiden. THUISSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 261–262. SASSEN 1963, 21–36. SASSEN 1970, 79–83. LINDEBOOM 1974. LINDEBOOM 1984, 1791–1794.

5 According to NH, Schuyt’s graduation took place on 9/19 July, whereas the entry in *Album Prom. Acad. Rhen.-Traj.* reads 3/13 July. The manuscript of NH does not mention the date of Schuyt’s disputation. The date in the *Album* is the more likely, as it concerns a Wednesday, one of the two weekdays on which disputations were normally submitted (see my introductory note on Utrecht University), whereas 9/19 July is a Tuesday. No copy of Schuyt’s disputation is known to exist. LINDEBOOM 1984, 1791 mistakenly points to the disputation *Positiones politicae et oeconomicae* (Utrecht: Æg. Roman, 1639) as Schuyt’s inaugural theses; Schuyt defended this particular disputation on 25 May 1639 OS, the *praeses* being Senguerd.

6 ‘Quae hactenus semina contentionum sub glebis delituisse videbantur, primum erumpere coeperunt, occasione disputationis D. Florentii Schuilii, pro obtinendo Philosophiae magisterio publice institutae 9 Jul. anno 1639, ubi cum Opponents, secundum sententiam novae Philosophiae, omnes qualitates attractrices et qualitatem occultam magnetis oppugnaret, Medicus [sc. Regius] stans in subselliis D. Senguerdio, ordinario Philosophiae Professore et Promotori, satis indecore insultavit, et contra Doctiss. Candidatum, D. Senguerdii discipulum, triumphum ante victoriam cecinit; cum tamen, omnium Professorum iudicio, Candidatus perquam solide et dextre omnia objecta dilueret, et non inconcinne Opponentem perstringeret, atque ad terminos revocaret’, NH, 14 (*Querelle*, 86–87).

7 ‘Cette action que nous n’avons apprise que par le canal de Voetius’, *Vie*, II, 34. The remark shows that Baillet’s only source is NH.

that the respondent had not been able to refute the arguments of the New Philosophy, which in itself would have been embarrassing enough, the disputation being *pro gradu*. In any case, since chaotic disputations were the rule rather than the exception, the event may not have been as extraordinary as NH pictures it.⁸

Although Baillet's only source is NH, his account of the disputation contains an element not found in NH. According to Baillet, Schuyt was not able to reply to the opponent's objections, and Senguerd assisted him in refuting the arguments of the New Philosophy himself. Senguerd's intervention would have angered Regius, claiming triumph for the opponent.⁹ This is Baillet's own interpretation of the event, as NH does not relate Senguerd's intrusion, but explicitly states that Schuyt defended himself very well against the opponent.¹⁰

⁸ DE VRIJER 1917, 32–33.

⁹ 'Le répondant, quoique fort bien exercé sur les cahiers de son maître, parut un peu embarrassé, mais le professeur ayant pris la parole pour le dégager, M. Regius se leva, et sans respecter ni l'assemblée ni la profession, l'interrompit, lui insulta mal à propos, et voulut adjuger à l'agresseur une victoire que l'honnêteté et la coutume l'obligeaient de laisser au répondant', *Vie*, II, 34.

¹⁰ Secondary literature focuses on Baillet's account of the event and is, therefore, trivial. De Vrijer, for example, takes the view that the blame should not be Regius', but Senguerd's for coming to his student's rescue (DE VRIJER 1917, 31). Cf. DUKER 1861, 74; MONCHAMP 1886, 398; DUKER 1989, II, 142–143; DIBON 1954, 205; SASSEN 1963, 22–23; SASSEN 1970, 79; LINDEBOOM 1974, 14–17; RODIS-LEWIS 1995, 231.

Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]

[first half of September 1639]

Vie, II, 35 (no. 5).
AT, II, 582 (no. 172).

M. Regius vit passer la foire, et finir le temps de ses vacances sans avoir eu l'avantage qu'il avait espéré.¹ Il fallut reprendre les leçons publiques avant que de pouvoir réparer la chose par un voyage qu'il aurait souhaité de faire à Egmond.² Et comme il lui fallait au moins deux jours libres pour cette course, il ne les put
5 trouver que vers le milieu de Septembre [*i.m.*: Lettr. 5 MS. de Reg. à Desc.], auquel sa femme ne permit pas même qu'il s'éloignât d'elle à cause d'une grossesse de huit mois et demi où elle avait besoin de lui.³

COMMENTARY

Date

Regius informs Descartes that he would have liked to visit him sometime in mid-September, but his wife being eight and a half months pregnant needs the assistance of her husband. Baillet does not give the date of the letter, but the child, a son, died on 16/26 September, three days after it was born. The letter can therefore be placed in the first half of September (NS).

Context

In continuation of R/D 9A, Baillet reports the frequent exchange of letters between Regius and Descartes in the autumn of 1639:

Le temps de M. Descartes n'en fut pas plus épargné. Il ne fut presque occupé que de ses réponses aux consultations de M. Regius pendant les mois de Septembre et Octobre. Quelques longues, quelques fréquentes que fussent les lettres d'un disciple si zélé, il ne plaignait point pour l'instruire un temps qu'il ne croyait jamais regretter. L'importance des questions et des difficultés qu'il lui proposait, l'empêchait de rien négliger pour le mettre en état d'établir ses principes. Elles roulaient la plupart sur la nature des anges, sur celle de l'âme de l'homme, sur son union avec le corps, sur l'âme des bêtes et des plantes, sur la vie, sur le mouvement du cœur, et sur la circulation du sang.⁴

1 See R/D 7.

2 In 1639, Descartes lived in Santpoort and not in Egmond (see my introductory note on *Descartes' whereabouts 1635–1650*).

3 On 13/23 September 1639, Regius' wife, Maria de Swart, bore a son, but the child lived for only three days (see R/D 10, n. 5). Regius had five children, but only his daughter Maria (†1657) survived infancy (DE VRIJER 1917, 16).

4 *Vie*, II, 35–36.

[first half of September 1639]

R/D 8

The 'frequent exchange of letters' is without a doubt an invention of Baillet, since the only letter he mentions as being written in September and October 1639 is the present letter. All particular questions listed by Baillet are dealt with in the correspondence, but none in the letters from 1639.⁵

⁵ On the nature of angels: D/R 31, ll. 40–42; on the human soul: D/R 19, D/R 31, D/R 33; union of mind and body: D/R 29, D/R 31, D/R 33, D/R 45; the souls of plants and beasts: D/R 19; life: D/R 45, ll. 14–20; movement of the heart and circulation of the blood: D/R 13, D/R 21, D/R 26, D/R 27, D/R 28.

Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]

[first half of November 1639]

Vie, II, 36 [A], 54–55 [B], 52 [C] (no. 6).
 AT, II, 616–617 [A, B] (no. 176).

[A]

L'opinion de M. Descartes sur cette dernière question¹ l'avait mise en grand crédit parmi les savants; et elle avait merveilleusement contribué à rétablir sur ce sujet la réputation de Guillaume Harvée,² qui s'était trouvée maltraitée par les satires et le décri de divers médecins des Pays-Bas, la plupart ignorants ou entêtés des
 5 anciennes maximes de leurs Facultés. C'est ce qui fit que le public reçût assez mal ce que deux médecins nommés Parisanus et Primerosius, firent imprimer à Leyde chez le Maire, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 6 MS de Reg. à Desc.] vers le mois de Septembre de cette année, touchant la circulation du sang, contre le sentiment de Harvée.³

[B]

Cependant il était arrivé un fâcheux contretemps au sieur Waessenaer, lorsqu'il fut question de se rendre à Leyde, où l'on avait transporté le bureau de cette affaire.⁴ [*I.m.*: Lettre 6 de Reg. MS.] Il était tombé dangereusement malade sur la fin d'Octobre d'une fausse pleurésie, accompagnée d'une très grande difficulté de
 5 respirer. Le mal le réduisit fort bas, et le conduisit fort avant dans le mois de Novembre. De sorte que M. Regius, qui était son médecin, se crut obligé d'en écrire à M. Descartes, et d'en informer même Messieurs de Leyde, afin qu'on ne crût pas qu'il eût pris ce prétexte pour ne pas se trouver à l'assignation donnée de sa part au sieur Stampioen, et qu'il se fût défié de la bonté de sa cause.⁵ Il ne lui fut

1 *Sc.* the circulation of the blood.

2 William Harvey (1578–1657) studied in Cambridge and Padua, where he graduated in medicine in 1602. He set up practice in London, and in 1618 became court physician of the English kings James I (1603–1625) and his successor Charles I (1625–1649). In 1615 he was appointed Lumlerian lecturer in anatomy and surgery. In 1628 he published his revolutionary work on the circulation of the blood, *Exercitatio de motu cordis et sanguinis in animalibus* (Frankfurt am Mainz, W. Fitzer). DNB, 25, 94–99. DSB, 3, 150–162.

3 W. Harvey, *De motu cordis et sanguinis in animalibus anatomica exercitatio. Cum refutationibus Æmilii Parisani ... et Jacobi Primirosii* (Leiden: J. Maire, 1639). Æmilius Parisanus (1567–1643; BLA, 4, 505) and James Primrose (see my commentary) both opposed Harvey's theory. The volume published by Maire contains Harvey's *De motu cordis* as well as the refutations by Parisanus (a reprint of Parisanus' *Exercitationes de subtilitate*, Venice: M.A. Brogiollus, 1635), and Primrose (a reprint of PRIMROSE 1630). Cf. KEYNES 1989, 36–37.

4 The Stampioen-affair is outlined in my commentary on R/D 6. In Leiden Van Waessenaer was expected to deposit his wager with the notary Jacob Verwey, who would entrust the money to the rector of Leiden University, Nicolas Dedel.

5 The letter to Verwey and/or Dedel appears to be lost.

10 pas aussi ais  de consoler son malade, que ce contretemps chagrina plus | que la 55
douleur du mal. Il n'en put venir   bout qu'en lui repr sentant que M. Waessenaer
son p re pourrait aller   Leyde, s'il en  tait besoin, pour la consignation de son
argent, et pour y tenir toutes choses en bon  tat devant les juges et la partie, jusqu' 
ce qu'il f t r tabli.⁶

[C] = R/D 6D, ll. 11–16

Waessenaer  tait somm  par ces billets de maintenir et d montrer ce qu'il avait
 crit contre Stampioen; mais il ne crut pas devoir s'engager   rien avant que de
consulter M. Descartes, dont il suivait la m thode et l'analyse g om trique, comme
nous l'apprenons de Regius et de Lipstorp. [*l.m.*: Reg. ut supr. [Lettr. 3] et
5 Epist. 6. Listorp. de certitud. Phil. Cart. p. 12 et 13.]

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet does not give the date of the letter, but text B contains sufficient information to fix the date. According to Baillet, Van Waessenaer Jr fell seriously ill towards the end of October, and his affliction persisted well into November. Since he was expected in Leiden to deposit a large sum of money, Regius wrote to Descartes to explain the situation, and proposed that if necessary Van Waessenaer Sr would go instead. A notarial document confirms the receipt of the money on 14 November 1639 (ROTH 1926, 274–277). The letter consequently dates from the first half of November.

⁶ On 14 November 1639, Verwey handed Van Waessenaer's money over to the rector of Leiden University (ROTH 1926, 274–277, original Dutch text with English translation; French translation in AT II 720–721). In a letter to Huygens, Descartes mentions that on 14 November Van Waessenaer was not present in Leiden, which suggests that his illness prevented him from attending the occasion (ROTH 1926, 101/AT II 689).

10
Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]
3 December 1639

Vie, II, 47–48 (no. [7]).
AT, II, 624–625 (no. 178).

Mr Descartes avait quitté le séjour d’Egmond depuis quelque temps, et il s’était retiré à Harderwick peut-être dans le dessein de se dérober à ceux qui s’accoutumaient à l’importuner.¹ M. Regius se trouvant encore trop éloigné de lui, crut qu’étant une fois hors de sa chère solitude de Nort-Hollande, toute autre demeure lui serait
5 assez indifférente. C’est ce qui le porta à lui en écrire au commencement du mois de Décembre, [*i.m.*: Le 3 de ce mois.] pour le conjurer de vouloir se rapprocher d’Utrecht,² tant pour son intérêt particulier qui lui faisait considérer la commodité qu’il aurait de conférer avec lui plus souvent, que pour la satisfaction de quantité d’amis qu’il avait dans la ville, et surtout de M. le Colonel Alphonse,³ qui l’avait
10 chargé de lui marquer sa passion là-dessus. Il prit cette occasion pour lui faire le récit de ce qui s’était passé à son sujet en une célèbre compagnie, où il s’était trouvé dans la ville de Leyde. Il y était allé au mois de Novembre,⁴ après que sa femme fut relevée de ses couches qui lui avaient produit un fils qui ne vécut que trois jours, pour être présent à la réception d’un de ses parents au rang des
15 Docteurs en droit.⁵ Durant le festin que le nouveau docteur donna aux Professeurs et à plusieurs autres personnes, la plupart gens de lettres, le discours ne manqua pas de tomber sur M. Descartes, dont plusieurs des conviés se disaient amis. Il en fut parlé comme du plus rare génie du siècle, et | comme d’un homme extraordinaire-
48 ment suscité pour ouvrir les voies de la véritable philosophie. Les plus ardents à publier son mérite furent M. Golius, Professeur des mathématiques et des langues orientales, et le sieur Abraham *Heidanus*, Ministre, et célèbre Prédicateur de la

1 See R/D 8, n. 2. There is no independent evidence that Descartes visited Harderwijk in November or December 1639.

2 According to Baillet (*Vie*, II, 51), Descartes accepted the invitation, and remained for some time in a ‘maison de campagne’ near Utrecht (cf. KRAMM 1874, VERBEEK 1993D, 7–8, 21–23). If Descartes did visit Utrecht, his stay was fairly short, for his letters to Huygens of 17 December 1639, 3 January and 12 March 1640 were all dispatched from Santpoort (ROTH 1926, 117, 126, 131/AT II 705, III 742, 747).

3 I.e. Alphonse Pollot; on him, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

4 Read ‘Septembre’, see the following note.

5 On 16/26 September 1639, the death bell of the Domchurch tolled for Regius’ little son (DRAKENBORCH 1895, 149). If Baillet’s information that the child lived for only three days is correct, Regius’ unnamed son would have been born on 13/23 September. The relative Baillet refers to is a cousin of Regius, Hugo de Roy (c.1617–?), who matriculated at Leiden University on 30 October 1631 (*Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 239). He graduated in law on 29 September 1639 (DE ROY 1639; MOLHUYSEN 1913–24, II, 231), and became a lawyer in Utrecht. In 1645, he published a panegyric on the Stadholder Frederik Hendrik for his capture of Hulst (DE ROY 1645A), and a treatise on the notion of justice (DE ROY 1645B).

3 December 1639

R/D 10

ville.⁶ [...] ⁷ Ces deux Messieurs ne se lassaient pas de faire admirer à la compagnie la grandeur de l'esprit de M. Descartes et la beauté de ses découvertes. Mais sur ce que M. Regius les interrompit, pour dire qu'il n'y avait point eu de philosophes
25 dans toute l'Antiquité, ni dans les temps postérieurs, que M. Descartes ne surpassât infiniment, M. Heydanus lui demanda ce qu'il pensait des Pythagoriciens et de leur philosophie. A quoi M. Regius répondit que le fort de la philosophie Pythagoricienne consistait principalement dans la science des nombres, mais que,
30 auprès de M. Descartes.

COMMENTARY

Date

The date of the letter, 3 December 1639, is given by Baillet. We have no indication as to the calendar used. Baillet does not mention the number of the letter in the Clerselier collection. As Adam and Tannery point out, it is probably number 7, because R/D 9 has number 6, and Regius' next letter has number 8 in the Clerselier collection (R/D 11).

⁶ For Golius and Heydanus, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

⁷ Baillet supplies the reader with an observation on Heydanus by Sorbière: 'Le sage Monsieur Heydanus, que l'escole Cartesienne revere comme son principal protecteur, et qui nonobstant une profession severe a toutes les douceurs, et tout le beau tour d'esprit que l'on peut desirer en une personne fort accomplie', SORBIÈRE 1660B, 137; BLOK 1901, 64.

11
Regius to Descartes [Santpoort]
[early 1640]

Vie, II, 20–21 [A], 36–37 [B], 57 [C]; *ExI*, I (MS 4469), 358 [D] (nos. 8, 10).
AT, III, 1–2, 3–4 (no. 181–II, partly).

[A] (In continuation of *ÆM/D* 5)

La principale louange que M. Emilius avait à donner à l'illustre défunt [Reneri],
était d'avoir eu assez de courage pour se défaire de l'autorité des Anciens et
des Modernes qui l'avaient précédé, afin de rentrer dans la liberté que Dieu a
donnée à notre raison pour se conduire dans la recherche de la vérité, qui est
5 la seule maîtresse dont nous soyons obligés de nous rendre sectateurs. C'était
une résolution véritablement héroïque qui ne pouvait convenir qu'à des esprits du
premier ordre. Mais il fallait que M. Descartes, qui la lui avait inspirée, comme
à quelques autres personnes qui s'étaient attachées à lui dès le commencement de
sa retraite en Hollande, fut le directeur de cette entreprise. [*I.m.*: Pag. 114 et suiv.
10 des orais. d'Emil.¹] M. Emilius fit valoir avec beaucoup d'éloquence les grands
progrès que M. Reneri avait faits dans la connaissance de la nature sous un chef
de cette qualité. Il rehaussa de couleurs fort vives l'honneur et l'avantage que
la ville et l'Université avaient reçus de la disposition où s'était trouvé M. Reneri
de pouvoir y enseigner les principes de la véritable philosophie, qu'il prétendait
15 être demeurée inconnue au genre humain jusqu'à M. Descartes. L'auditoire en
parut persuadé,² [*i.m.*: Lett. 10 MS. de Regius à Descartes] et les Magistrats, après
avoir honoré ce discours de leur approbation, ordonnèrent qu'il serait imprimé et
publiquement distribué sous leur autorité, tant pour honorer la mémoire de leur
Professeur, que pour donner des marques éclatantes de la reconnaissance qu'ils | 21
20 avaient du service important que leur avait rendu M. Descartes en formant un tel
disciple.³

[B]

M. Regius fut outré d'une conduite si malhonnête, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 10 MS. de Regius]
et ayant confronté son livre avec les réponses que M. Descar- | tes avait faites près 37
de deux ans auparavant à ses objections, il ne put retenir l'indignation qui lui fit

1 Baillet refers to the reprint of the funeral oration in *ÆMILIUS* 1651.

2 This is obviously exaggerated, as the majority of the audience had probably never heard of Descartes before. See my commentary on *ÆM/D* 5.

3 This is without a doubt another exaggeration of either Regius or Baillet. It was common practice that a funeral oration was printed.

prendre la plume pour en marquer ses ressentiments à M. Descartes.⁴ Les couleurs
 5 qu'il donne dans sa lettre à l'ingratitude et à la mauvaise foi de M. Plempius
 sont si vives, qu'on ne peut les exprimer de sa langue en la nôtre sans entrer
 dans de semblables transports de colère contre une conduite si lâche.⁵ Il dit qu'à
 l'égard des endroits où M. Descartes découvrait les secrets les plus cachés de
 la nature, et où consistait la principale force de ses réponses, Plempius a eu la
 10 malice de faire le muet, ou d'en omettre au moins la plus grande partie. Et que
 pour ceux qu'il rapporte, il les estropie et les mutile de telle manière qu'il en
 corrompt entièrement le sens. Qu'à l'endroit où il traite de la circulation du sang,
 il se contente de rapporter simplement les difficultés, comme si on n'y avait pas
 encore fait de réponses, quoique celles que M. Descartes y avait données fussent
 15 très convaincantes. Qu'à l'endroit où M. Descartes rapporte plusieurs causes qui
 jointes ensemble produisent le battement du cœur, Plempius n'en rapporte qu'une
 qui est la chaleur. Si M. Descartes, après avoir allégué les raisons nécessaires
 pour la conviction d'une chose, y en ajoute quelque autre moins nécessaire servant
 seulement à un plus grand éclaircissement de la chose, Plempius est assez de
 20 mauvaise foi pour ne s'attacher qu'à cette dernière raison, comme si elle avait
 été donnée pour fondamentale ou essentielle; et laissant à supposer que ce serait
 l'unique qui aurait été alléguée par M. Descartes, il s'étudie à la rendre ridicule;
 ce qu'il fait ordinairement dans les endroits qu'il ne comprend pas.

[C]

L'impression de l'oraison funèbre de Monsieur Reneri faite pour le commencement
 de l'année 1640 par l'ordre des mêmes Magistrats,⁶ avait encore aigri son [Voetius']
 esprit de nouveau, mais elle ne l'avait pas découragé. Il avait cru, au contraire, que
 sous les acclamations publiques que l'on donnait à M. Descartes, il pourrait agir
 5 plus sourdement, et avec moins de soupçons contre lui. [*I.m.*: Lettr. MS. de Reg. 8
 et 10. Lettr. d'Emil. à Desc.,⁷ etc.] Mais pour venir à bout de cette entreprise, il
 fallait ruiner M. Regius. C'est à quoi il travailla de toutes ses forces, s'étudiant à
 rechercher dans ses leçons et ses écrits de quoi lui susciter un procès.

4 In his letter of 15 February 1638, Descartes answers several questions put to him by Plemp. The Leuven professor discusses these replies in PLEMPIUS 1638 (see AT I 534–536). The present letter confirms that Regius had received copies of Descartes' correspondence with Plemp (cf. R/D 1, ll. 28–31).

5 Cf. D/R 13, ll. 42–45.

6 Baillet only knew the reprint of the oration in ÆMILIUS 1651, and he was unaware that the original title page gives 1639 as the year of publication. The oration was probably printed towards the end of 1639, because the printer of the Academy, Ægidius Roman, did not charge the city for printing orations between January and September 1639, whereas the city's treasurer paid him for publishing several orations in the period October 1639 till September 1640 (GAU, 'Rekeningen van de tweede kameraar'). For the printer Roman, see EVERS 1934, 28–31; GRUYS/DE WOLF 1980, 77.

7 ÆM/D 5.

[D]

Ce Medecin s'appelle M^r Plempius comme on le peut voir dans la 8^e et 10^e lettre de celles que M^r le Roy a ecrites a M^r Desc(artes) ...

[...]

5 ... par la 10^e lettre de M^r le Roy a M^r Descartes il est constant que M^r le Roy avoit fait venir de Leide le livre de M^r Plempius⁸ des le commencement de l'année 1640 ...⁹

COMMENTARY

Date

The exact dates of Regius' letters 8 and 10 in the Clerselier collection, taken together in R/D 11 because letter 8 is mentioned only once in connection with letter 10, are not found in *Vie* nor in *ExI*. A note in *ExI* (text D), however, gives an indication for the date of the letters: referring to letter no. 10 it states that Regius received a copy of Plemp's *De fundamentis medicinae* (PLEMPIUS 1638) in early 1640. This date is confirmed by Baillet's observation that Æmilius' funeral oration for Reneri (ÆMILIUS 1639) appeared in early 1640 (text C, ll. 1–2). Although Baillet is in fact mistaken — the oration was printed in (late) 1639 — his remark shows that he assumes R/D 11 to be written in early 1640.

Text

My presentation of R/D 11 differs from AT in two respects. First, Adam and Tannery take Regius' letters 8 and 10 in the Clerselier collection together with a letter by Æmilius (no. 9 in the Clerselier collection), whereas I list Æmilius' letter separately (ÆM/D 5). Second, I add text D, part of the *ExI*-note quoted above, which explicitly refers to Regius letters 8 and 10 in the Clerselier collection.

*Context**Baillet and the ExI on the correspondence between Descartes and Plemp*

The note in *ExI*¹⁰ I use to date R/D 11 does not concern the Descartes–Regius correspondence, but Descartes' epistolary exchange with Plemp on the circulation of the blood in early 1638. The four letters in question are published in CLE without date or

⁸ PLEMPIUS 1638.

⁹ Clerselier published the correspondence between Descartes and Plemp on the circulation of the blood without mentioning either the addressee or the date. In the note in the *ExI*, addressee and date of the correspondence are deduced (see my commentary).

¹⁰ On the *ExI* in general, see the Introduction, § 2.3.

Plemp's name.¹¹ The note in *ExI* serves to establish the approximate date of the letters and to identify Descartes' correspondent. In establishing the date and the addressee, the annotator of the *ExI* makes use of three documents, namely of Regius' letters 8 and 10 in the Clerselier collection (R/D 11), and of D/R 13 (24 May 1640). The note runs as follows:

Ce Medecin s'appelle M^r Plempius comme on le peut voir dans la 8^e et 10^e lettre de celles que M^r le Roy a ecrites a M^r Desc. qui sont inserees dans les fragmens. et par les lettres 7 et 9 du 2 Volume.¹² L'on voit aussy que cette lettre et les 3 suivantes sont du commencement de l'année 1638. puisque par la 10^e lettre de M^r le Roy a M^r Descartes il est constant que M^r le Roy avoit fait venir de Leide le livre de M^r Plempius¹³ des le commencement de l'année 1640, puis que M^r Descartes dans la 81^e de ses lettres du 1^{er} Vol. quj est la 1^{ere} adressee a M. le Roy il dit que des personnes avoient tiré copie de ses reponses a Monsr Plempius deux ans avant que le livre de M^r Plempius parut. V. encore la lettre 87 du 2 Vol. p. 378.¹⁴

The conclusion — the addressee is Plemp and the correspondence dates from early 1638 — is correct. The argumentation for the date, however, is based on two false premises: 1. Plemp published the correspondence in *De fundamentis medicinae* in 1640; 2. the correspondence took place two years before it was published by Plemp.

The first premise is based upon R/D 11. Because Regius received Plemp's book in early 1640, the annotator assumed that the work actually appeared in 1640.¹⁵ In reality, *De fundamentis medicinae* was published in September 1638.¹⁶

The second premise is based upon the following passage in D/R 13, in which Descartes comments on Regius' accusation that Plemp distorted Descartes' arguments in *De fundamentis medicinae*:

Ubi dicis cur Pl(empius) meas responsiones mutilasset, posset forte addi probatio, quod, biennio ante eius librum, a multis fuerint visae et exscriptae.¹⁷

The annotator read the passage as follows: 'Where you say that Plemp mutilated my replies, you could perhaps add the proof of that, namely that these replies were seen

11 Plemp to Descartes, [January 1638] (AT I 497–499), Descartes to Plemp, 15 February 1638 (AT I 521–534), Plemp to Descartes, [March 1638] (AT II 52–54), and Descartes to Plemp, 23 March 1638 (AT II 62–69). Clerselier gives the letters in a French translation, for which he used VAN BEVERWIJCK 1644. Descartes supplied Johan van Beverwijck with copies of the correspondence (cf. AT III 3–6, 717–718). In Van Beverwijck's edition the correspondence is without date and Plemp is not specifically named. On Van Beverwijck and his possible meeting with Descartes, see R/D 52A. On Van Beverwijck, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

12 Respectively Descartes to Plemp, 3 October 1637 (AT I 409–412) and Descartes to Plemp, 20 December 1637 (AT I 475–477). In both cases Clerselier supplies the correspondent's name.

13 PLEMPIUS 1638.

14 Descartes to Huygens, 9 March 1639. The draft of the letter is published in CLE without date and addressee (AT II 49). The autograph is in ROTH 1926, 72/AT II 660.

15 This is Baillet's opinion as well, cf. *Vie*, II, 36.

16 Plemp's dedication of *De fundamentis medicinae* is dated 30 August 1638 (cf. AT I 521).

17 D/R 13, ll. 42–45; AT III 68.

and copied by many two years before his book [appeared]'.¹⁸ This rendering, which is in itself a correct translation, is mistaken, because the correspondence in question took place in early 1638, and Plemp's book was published in the same year. The appropriate translation, the second interpretation, would therefore be: 'two years ago, before his book [appeared]'. However, I am not sure that this is what Descartes meant in D/R 13. It may very well be the case that Regius did not inform Descartes of the year of publication of Plemp's work, but only that he had received it in early 1640. Indeed, if Regius had mentioned the year of publication, it is difficult to explain the annotator's assumption that the work appeared in 1640. Now, if Regius did not mention the year of publication, Descartes will have assumed that it had appeared recently, which can account for the first interpretation.

This explanation is somewhat undermined by Regius himself. He adopted Descartes' suggestion to add proof of Plemp's misconduct in his first disputation; in fact he repeated Descartes' own words: 'litterae istae, biennio ante editum Plempii librum à compluribus descriptae' (AT III 732). Regius would in any case have known that the first interpretation is incorrect. Did he just naturally choose for the second interpretation, or did he not give Descartes' comment a second thought?

Finally, there is Plemp himself. Ushered by Regius, he published Descartes' letters in extenso in the second edition of *De fundamentis medicinae* (PLEMPIUS 1644). But he shows his discontent with Regius, saying that it is slander to claim that the letters in question were seen and copied two years before his book appeared, because they were written in the same year as the book as published, indeed, the chapter in which the letters are found was printed in the same month.¹⁹ So Plemp demonstrates that the first interpretation is false, but then again, perhaps he deliberately chooses the first interpretation in order to be able to refute a false accusation.

¹⁸ This is in fact the standard interpretation/translation, cf. AM IV 65–66; RL, 31; M, 335; B, 97.

¹⁹ PLEMPIUS 1644, 152; also in AT I 536.

12
Regius to Descartes [Leiden]
5 [/15] May 1640

Vie, II, 24 [A], 59 [B], 103 [C] (no. 11).
AT, III, 60–61 (no. 188).

[A]

[*L.m.*: Narrat. Hist. Acad. Ultr. p. 12.¹] Ils assemblèrent leur Université, et sur la proposition favorable du Recteur Schotanus, il fut résolu qu'on en ferait la demande aux Magistrats.² Le Recteur lui-même fut député au Sénat pour cet effet, avec le sieur Arnold Senguerdius, Professeur en philosophie. Les Magistrats n'eurent
5 aucune peine à l'accorder, tant à cause de la satisfaction que M. Regius avait donnée à tout le monde jusque-là, que parce que le sieur Stratenus, son ancien, qui avait le plus d'intérêt de s'y opposer, et de demander ces augmentations de gages pour lui, était des premiers et des plus ardents à solliciter pour son nouveau collègue. [*L.m.*: Lettr. XI MS. de Reg. à Desc.] Ainsi les appointements de M. Regius, qui
10 n'avaient été que de 400 florins jusqu'alors, furent rehaussés de la moitié; mais il ne commença que l'année suivante à toucher les 600 florins.³ Encore y attachait-on un nouvel emploi, qui consistait à expliquer les problèmes de physique, lorsqu'il ne serait pas occupé de sa botanique, c'est-à-dire de l'explication des plantes et des
15 simples.⁴ Il fit part à M. Descartes de la joie qu'il avait reçue de cette commission, parce qu'elle lui présentait de nouvelles occasions d'enseigner et d'étendre sa nouvelle philosophie.

1 NH, 12/*Querelle*, 85–86.

2 Although full professor since March 1639 (see R/D 4, n. 4), Regius' salary had never been raised, and his wage of 400 guilders was considerably less than that of the other Utrecht professors. Senguerd for example, appointed at the same time as Regius, earned 700 guilders since he became full professor. In April 1640, the Senate decided to request the Vroedschap to raise Regius' wage.

3 Baillet is mistaken as to the date. On 17/27 April 1640, the Vroedschap raised Regius' salary to 600 guilders as from 5/15 April 1640 (*Resolutiën*, 139–140). For the text of the resolution, see my commentary.

4 For Regius' course in physics, see my commentary. 'Simple' is a general term for medicinal plants, cf. MANUIA 1970–1975, III, 681. In 1639, the Vroedschap and Regius took care of the planning of the botanical garden on the Sonneburgh bulwark. The Leiden hortus offered a large quantity of seeds (WUNNE 1888, 41; *Resolutiën*, 132), and the professor of botany himself billed the city for various purchases (DODT VAN FLENSBURG 1843, 292, 294, 298). Regius' competence in botany was challenged during a disputation presided by Stratenus in December 1641 (NH, 25/*Querelle*, 95; cf. SCHOOCK 1643, [LIII], 9, 37, 38 43/*Querelle*, 169, 184, 198–199, 201 and *Epistola ad Voetium*, AT VIII B 15–16). His sole publication on the subject is REGIUS 1650B, which is no more than a plan of the hortus, a workbook for students, who were to fill in the names of the plants and their properties themselves.

[B]

M. Regius avait eu soin auparavant [*i.m.*: En Mai 1640.] de prendre avec M. Descartes des mesures nécessaires pour mettre ses thèses hors d'atteinte, et il lui avait fait croire, en lui proposant la chose, qu'il n'avait dans ces thèses point d'autre dessein que d'étendre sa philosophie, et de lui donner de l'éclat. Ses écoliers le pressaient, dit-il, [*i.m.*: Lettr. XI de Regius, MS.] incessamment de faire imprimer sa physique, afin d'exposer aux yeux de tout l'univers une philosophie qui ne faisait encore bruit que dans quelques provinces. Il y fit réflexion, et ayant cru qu'il serait à propos de sonder les esprits par quelque essai, il avait eu la pensée de la réduire auparavant en questions, et de la proposer dans des disputes publiques. Mais quelques-uns de ses collègues, appréhendant que les nouvelles opinions dont elle était remplie ne fissent quelque tort à leur Université, à cause que son établissement était encore assez récent, crurent qu'il valait mieux la faire imprimer comme l'écrit d'un simple particulier. M. Regius estima néanmoins qu'il serait bon de la faire précéder d'une dispute publique pour en être le prélude, et il choisit ses opinions concernant le mouvement du cœur, des artères, et du sang, pour en former ses thèses, qu'il envoya ensuite à M. Descartes pour les corriger.⁵

[C]

Cependant il [Descartes] avait fait voir son manuscrit⁶ à quelques amis d'Utrecht [*i.m.*: Dès le mois de Mai 1640.] qui l'en avaient instamment sollicité, et particulièrement à Messieurs Regius et Emilius qui en furent charmés jusqu'à l'extase. [*i.m.*: Lettr. 11 de Regius MS. du 5 de Mai.] M. Descartes, qui ne cherchait pas les éloges de ses amis, leur avait enjoint d'examiner l'écrit, tant en grammairiens qu'en philosophes. Il fallut obéir, mais ils ne trouvèrent à toucher qu'à la ponctuation et à l'orthographe.⁷ [*i.m.*: Tom. 1 des lettr. page 384, 385.⁸]

⁵ Descartes' comments are found in D/R 13. The disputation, REGIUS 1640A, was submitted on 10/20 June 1640, cf. my commentary on R/D 14.

⁶ In November 1639, Descartes informed Mersenne of his new project in metaphysics, the *Meditationes de prima philosophia*, the composition of which he completed in March 1640 (to Mersenne, 13 November 1639, AT II 622/CM VIII 611; 11 March 1640, AT III 35/CM IX 189–190). In November 1640, Descartes sent the manuscript to Mersenne to have it printed in Paris (AT III 235/CM X 232). The book left the printing office of Michel Soly in August 1641. The history of the text is analysed in CRAPULLI 1976, and VAN OTEGEM 2002, I, 152–161.

⁷ Baillet's *Vie* continues with R/D 14C, in which the biographer remarks that Regius and Æmilius submitted two objections as well. Descartes' replies are found in D/R 15.

⁸ D/R 15, ll. 1–9.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 5 May 1640, without indication of the calendar used. The *ExI*, in two annotations to D/R 13, which is Descartes' reply to the present letter, provides sufficient information to fix the date on 5 [/15] May. The first note confirms Baillet's date of 5 May.⁹ According to the second note, Regius' letter no. 11 to Descartes in the Clerselier collection — the present letter — is dated 15 May.¹⁰ The first note and Baillet date the letter according to the Julian calendar, the second note to the Gregorian calendar.

*Context**1. Regius' course on physical problems*

The records of the Vroedschap of 17/27 April 1640 relate the following regarding Regius' salary increase:

The salary of Henrick de Roy, Medicinae et Botanices Professor of the Academy in this town, is raised to six hundred guilders a year, with effect from last Easter [5/15 April 1640], on condition that he takes on whatever courses the Burgomasters and the governors are herewith authorised to decide upon.¹¹

In order to entice the Vroedschap to raise his salary, Regius asked Voetius to intercede with the second Burgomaster for permission to lecture once a week on physical problems (*Problemata*¹²).¹³ Regius explained that, since he would deal with particular questions of optics, mechanics, et cetera, the lectures would not interfere with the regular philosophical curriculum. Voetius agreed, and the professor of philosophy, Arnold Senguerdius, did not object.¹⁴ NH subsequently recounts how Regius misused his course to explain the 'arcana of the new and presumptuous philosophy', while

9 'Celle cy sert de reponse a celles de Mr le Roy de 5 May 1640. La 12e lettre de Mr le Roy, datee du 20 May 1640 sert de reponse a celle cy', *ExI*, I, 384, *in margine*.

10 'Cette lettre [...] repond a (la) 11e des Ms de Roy, dattée du 15 May 1640 et la 12e des Ms de Regius du 30 May 1640 repond a celle cy', *ExI*, I, note on an inserted leaflet, attached to p. 384.

11 'De Gaige van Do. Henrick de Roy, Medicinae et Botanices Professor in de Academie alhier, is verhoort tot ses hondert guldens 's jaers, ingegaen Paesschen verleden, mits doende sulcke lessen als arbitren sullen d'Heeren Burgemeesteren ende Gecommitteerden, die daertoe geauthoriseert worden bij desen', *Resolutiën*, 139–140.

12 *Problemata* is a pseudo-Aristotelian collection of medical and physical problems.

13 It is suggested in the manuscript version of NH that the Vroedschap had no sufficient means at the time: 'Quandoquidem autem hoc D.D. Professorum pro D. Regio conatu non statim effectum fuit quod sperabatur, sive quod difficilis esset Ampliss. Senatus ad majores expensas pro illo tempore, sive quod gravissimis et publicis negotiis alia aliis urgentibus protelaretur', RAU, *Acta Academiae Ultraiectinae*, f. 44v. In NH, 12, the complete passage is replaced by the words 'Circa idem tempus' ('Vers la même époque', *Querelle*, 85). On Frederick Ruysch (†1670), the second Burgomaster, see NNBW, III, 1107–1108. First Burgomaster from October 1639 till October 1640 was Anthonis de Goyer. Both men were re-elected in October 1640. VANDE WATER 1729, III, 196.

14 NH, 11–13/*Querelle*, 85–86.

attacking and despising traditional philosophy.¹⁵ In a letter to Mersenne, Descartes confirms that Regius did indeed nothing less than that.¹⁶

2. A Cartesian textbook of natural philosophy

In his private lectures, the courses reserved for advanced students, Regius used to dictate his students a textbook in the New Philosophy. Even before he took up the correspondence with Descartes, Regius set out to compose a compendium of natural philosophy along Cartesian lines, taking Descartes' *Météores* and *Dioptrique* for a starting point (R/D 1A, ll. 24–27). In the spring of 1639, Regius informed Descartes that he had almost completed the work, asking the philosopher's opinion on it (cf. R/D 6B, D/R 17, ll. 8–9). By the time he took on the lectures on *problemata*, a first version of the textbook was ready, and his students urged him to publish it (cf. R/D 12B). Over the years, the textbook figures under different names: *Physiologia*, *Compendium physices*, *Prodromus novae philosophiae*, and finally, in 1642, *Physica fundamenta*.¹⁷

No student's notebook has been retrieved, but fragments of one such notebook survive in Schoock's *Admiranda methodus*.¹⁸ In the introduction, partly quoted by Schoock, Regius announces he will follow the path of Descartes and adopt his principles (*Querelle*, 198). One of the chapters of the notebook is called 'Mundus' — probably after Descartes' *Le Monde*, a copy of which Regius received in the spring of 1641 (cf. D/R 19, ll. 75–79) — in which the Copernican worldview is defended (*Querelle*, 246).¹⁹ It was a complete textbook on physics, covering the whole of nature including man. Its success and Regius' wish to have it published, may have prompted Descartes to compose a textbook of his own (*Principia philosophiae*, 1644).²⁰

15 NH, 13/*Querelle*, 86. The adjectives *novae et praesumptae* are found in the manuscript version of NH, f. 45v.

16 '[Regius] fait profession ouverte de ma Philosophie, et fait mesme des leçons particulieres de Physique, et en peu de mois rend ses disciples capables de se moquer entierement de la vieille Philosophie', Descartes to Mersenne, 11 November 1640, AT III 231/CM X 223. Note that Descartes talks of private, not public, lectures in physics.

17 Cf. AT VII 582–583; D/R 17, ll. 13–14; REGIUS 1642, 20. The latter description indicates that it served as a prototype of Regius' *Fundamenta physices* (REGIUS 1646).

18 SCHOOCK 1643/*Querelle*, 157–320.

19 More references to the notebook are found in SCHOOCK 1643/*Querelle*, 247, 251, 282, 286, 288, 289–290, 292, 299–300.

20 Cf. Descartes to Mersenne, 11 November 1640, AT III 233/CM X 225–226; [December 1640], AT III 259–260/CM X 330.

13
Descartes [Leiden] to Regius
[24 May 1640]

CLE, I, 386–389, (no. 81-V).
AT, III, 66–70 (no. 190-V).
AM, IV, 62–69; RL, 26–32; M, 333–338; B, 94–99.

In titulo non ponerem *de triplici coctione*, sed tantum *de coctione*.¹ Item etiam lineam nonam, pro N. et C(artesio),² rogo ut totam deleas; neque enim hîc valet Hervaei exemplum, qui longius hinc abest quam ego, nec, ut puto, Vallaeo³ tam coniunctus est quam ego tibi; et quamvis esset res
5 similis, non tam exemplo moveor quam causa.

In Thesium lineâ primâ, tollerem haec verba: *caloris vivifici*, etc.⁴

In fine, pro his verbis: *in rectâ conformatione* etc., mallet: *in* [67]
*praeparatione*⁵ *particularum insensibilium ex quibus alimenta constant, ut eae conformationem humano corpori componendo aptam acquirant.*
10 *Haec praeparatio alia est communis et minus praecipua, quae fit omnibus viis per quas particulae transeunt; alia particularis et praecipua, quae est triplex: 1. in ventriculo et intestinis, 2. in hepate, 3. in corde. 1^a In ventriculo et intestinis fit, cum cibus ore masticatus et deglutitus, sicut et potus, vi caloris à corde communicati, et humoris ab arteriis eò*
15 *impulsi, dissolvitur et in chylum convertitur. 2^a In hepate, cum chylus*

6 In ... no new paragraph in CLE 7 In ... no new paragraph in CLE

1 In D/R 13 Descartes comments on the draft of Regius' first disputation (REGIUS 1640A). Descartes probably objected to (a part of) the proposed title, because it sounds too traditional (see my commentary). The title page of the disputation, which was defended on 10/20 June 1640, reads *Pro sanguinis circulatione*, but reprinting the text in *Physiologia* IIa–b, Regius used the heading *De coctione* for the first part of the text (see Appendix, 212, l. 13). The only copy of REGIUS 1640A I was able to trace, is kept in the National Library of Medicine, Maryland. In AT III 727–734, the text of the disputation is reprinted from an unspecified copy unearthed by Cornelis de Waard.

2 In the ninth line of the title page Regius intended to put a dedication, which he withdrew from the definitive lay-out. The 'C' stands without a doubt for 'Cartesio', because it is clear from ll. 38–41 that Descartes was mentioned on the title page with his Latinised name. The 'N' probably denotes both Harvey and Walaëus since they are both mentioned in the lines that follow. Regius may have wanted to dedicate his disputation to the champions of the circulation of the blood, 'Pro Harvaeo, Walaëo et Cartesio', just like Walaëus had dedicated his disputation on blood circulation 'Pro Cl. Harveio' (WALAEUS 1640; on Johannes Walaëus, see the *Biographical Lexicon*). Such a dedication, however, would imply that they share the same views, something Descartes wishes to avoid (cf. to Mersenne, 9 February 1639, AT II 500–502/CM VIII 296–297). Descartes' remark may explain why Harvey is not mentioned at all in REGIUS 1640A.

3 Johannes Walaëus.

4 These words are not in the final text of the disputation, so Regius seems to have followed Descartes' advice.

5 REGIUS 1640A: 'adaptione'.

*in illud, non per aliquam vim attractricem, sed solâ suâ fluiditate et
 pressione vicinarum partium delatus, sanguinique reliquo mixtus, ibi
 fermentatur, digeritur,⁶ et in chymum abit. 3^a | In corde, cum chymus, 387
 sanguini à reliquo corpore ad cor redeunti permixtus, et simul cum eo in
 20 hepate praeparatus, in verum et perfectum sanguinem per ebullitionem
 pulsificam commutatur. Atque haec tertia coctio⁷ etc.⁸ Vides facilè cur
 ponam coctionem generalem quae fit in omnibus viis, et ex consequenti
 etiam in omni parte corporis; quia ubicunquè est motus, fieri potest ibi
 aliqua alteratio particularum quae moventur; et non video quid aliud
 25 coctio sit quam talis alteratio; nec cur potius illam in venis Gastricis et
 Meseraicis, quam in reliquis omnibus, fieri concedas. Non pono *succum
 spirituosum*, quia non video distinctè quid ista verba significant. Non
 pono *chyli partes meliores*, sed chylum, quia omnes eius partes alendo
 corpori inserviunt; et si benè calculum ponamus, ipsa etiam excrementa,
 30 praesertim quae ex venis excernuntur, quandiu sunt in corpore, inter eius
 partes sunt recensenda; munere enim ibi suo funguntur; et nulla est pars
 quae tandem non abeat in excrementum, modò id quod egreditur per
 insensilem transpirationem, excrementum etiam appellemus.⁹ Chymum
 autem fermentari puto in hepate, et digeri, hoc est, prout hoc verbum à
 35 Chymicis¹⁰ usurpatur, propter aliquam moram alterari.*

Pagina 5, deletem: *quae à copiosis eius spiritibus et oleoginositate
 moderata oritur; neque enim hoc satis clarè rem explicat.*¹¹

6 REGIUS 1640A: 'et (ut chymicorum more loquar) digeritur', cf. l. 34–35.

7 REGIUS 1640A: 'praeparatio'.

8 With some minor changes — the most significant ones are indicated above — Regius adopted Descartes' revision in REGIUS 1640A, [1–2]/AT III 727–728.

9 In *Physiologia* IIb, 29 (Appendix, 220, ll. 5–8), Regius lists insensible perspiration under bodily excretion, invoking the famous statical experiments performed by his Paduan instructor, Santorio Santorii (1561–1636). Santorii, one of Regius' supervisors at Padua in 1623 (see the *Chronicle*), studied philosophy and medicine at the famous University of Padua. After his graduation in medicine in 1582, he started his statical experiments in medicine, or quantitative investigations of metabolism. In 1611, Santorii was appointed professor of theoretical medicine in Padua, which chair he occupied till 1624. In 1614 he published his new ideas on medicine in *De medicina statica*, in which the quantitative significance of insensible perspiration is demonstrated. The Paduan professor introduced medical instruments that changed the history of medicine, including a thermometer to measure bodily temperature, and a *pulsilogium*, a device to measure the pulse. Our attention is aroused by his interesting analogy between organism and clock, the movements of which depend on number, form, and the disposition of parts. Cf. GRMEK 1990, 71–76, and Grmek's article on Santorii in DSB, 12, 101–104. Santorii's quantitative approach to medicine strongly influenced Regius. Cf. ROTHSCUH 1968, 51–52; FARINA 1975.

10 Descartes had an interest in chemistry (cf. to Mersenne, 15 April 1630, AT I 137/CM II 423), but a low opinion of the so-called (al-)chemists, the forerunners of Jean Baptiste van Helmont (1577–1644) (cf. to Mersenne, 30 July 1640, AT III 130–131/CM IX 524–525; to Mersenne, 7 December 1642, AT III 598/CM XI 364; to Newcastle, [23 November 1646], AT IV 569–570).

11 The explanation is indeed deleted in the final text of the disputation. It seems that Regius attempted to

In fine paginae 8, nomen meum rursus invenio, quod fortè honestiùs quàm in titulo possum dissimulare, modò, si placet, epithetis magis temperes; et malim etiam vero nomine *Descartes*, quàm ficto *Cartesius* vocari.¹²

Ubi dicis cur Pl(empius) meas responsiones mutilasset, posset fortè addi probatio, quòd, biennio ante eius librum, à multis fuerint visae et exscriptae.¹³ Videnturque etiam delenda haec verba: *vel callido vel ignorant*, et verba quam mitissima veritatem causae meliùs confirmabunt.¹⁴

Et finem paginae nonae sic mutarem: *secundo, quod foetus in utero existens, ubi isto respirationis usu privatur, duos habet meatus, qui spontè clauduntur in adultis; unum qui canaliculi instar est, | per quem pars sanguinis in dextro cordis sinu rarefacti in Aortam transmittitur, parte altera in pulmones abeunte; et alium, per quem pars sanguinis in sinistro cordis sinu rarefaciendi è Vena Cava defluit, et alteri parti ex pulmonibus venienti permiscetur.*¹⁵ Neque enim negari potest, quin sanguinis pars in foetu transeat per pulmones; sed praeterea usus respirationis explicatio, quae habetur pagina 10, praecedere debet eius causas, quae dantur pag. 8.

Quantùm ad Venas Lacteas, nihil definio, quia nondum illas vidi; sed novi hic duos iuvenes Medicinae Doctores (Silvius et Schagen nominantur¹⁶), qui videntur non indocti, et se illas saepius observasse

38 In ... no new paragraph in CLE 42 Ubi ... no new paragraph in CLE 46 Et ... no new paragraph in CLE 56 Quantùm ... no new paragraph in CLE

apply Descartes' theory on particles. Compare the corresponding text to Descartes' *Météores*, I–II (AT VI 231–248) in *Physiologia* I, 7–8 (Appendix, 203–204). Cf. ROTHSCUH 1968, 53.

12 Regius adjusted the text to '... viri Nobilissimi et Incomparabilis D. Renati des Cartes ...' (REGIUS 1640A, [5]/AT III 732). Descartes changed his mind on the issue of Descartes/Cartesius later that year (cf. to Mersenne, 31 December 1640, AT III 277/CM X 362), but all his Latin works are nonetheless published under his French name.

13 See R/D 1B, ll. 28–31, and R/D 11B, and especially my commentary on R/D 11.

14 Following Descartes' advice, Regius deleted these acrimonious words in REGIUS 1640A. For another example of Descartes' disapproval of Regius' language, see D/R 26, ll. 2–5.

15 The passage is taken over almost verbatim in REGIUS 1640A, [6]/AT III 733, with the notable exception of *in adultis*, l. 48, which Regius substituted with the more accurate *in lucem editis*. The explanation closely resembles *Discours* (AT VI 53), in which the observation that, although the fetus does not breathe, some blood passes through its lungs, is absent. It is also missing in Descartes' later work, *Description du corps humain* (AT XI 238).

16 For Franciscus de le Boe Sylvius, see the *Biographical Lexicon*. Franciscus van der Schagen (c.1615–1673) graduated at Leiden University in 1639, on a medical disputation *De epilepsia* (Leiden: B. and A. Elsevier; a copy in British Library). As a physician, he first practised in Leiden, then in Amsterdam. In 1640, he was present at the demonstrations on the circulation of the blood by Walaeus (cf. SCHOUTEN 1972, 116, LINDEBOOM 1984, 1737–1738). That Van der Schagen and Sylvius performed various anatomical experiments on blood circulation and the lymphatic vascular system together, is attested by Sylvius himself (cf. BAUMANN 1949, 14–15; M, 336) and Walaeus (WALAEUS 1641, 395, 408).

affirmant, earumque valvulas humoris regressum versus intestina im-
 60 pedire, adeò ut planè à te dissentiant;¹⁷ et ego in eorum sententiam
 valdè propendeo, ita ut suspicer Venas Lacteas ab illis Meseraicis in
 eo tantum differre, quod nulli arteriae sint coniunctae, ideoque succus
 ciborum in iis albus est, in aliis vero statim fit ruber, quia sanguini per
 arterias circulato permiscetur. Prima occasione illas in cane vivo simul
 65 quaeremus: interim, si mihi credis, totum illud corollarium omittes.¹⁸

Quod ad difficultatem, *quomodo cor possit detumescere, si pars
 sanguinis rarefacti in eo remaneat*, facilè solvitur; quia minima tantum
 eius pars manet, ventriculis implendis non sufficiens; impetus enim
 quo ille egreditur, sufficeret ad omnem educendum, nisi prius valvulae
 70 Arteriae magnae et Venae arteriosae clauderentur,¹⁹ quàm totus esset
 elapsus; et quantumvis parva portio in ventriculis manens sufficit ad
 fermentationem.

Tandem tandem hodie accepimus sententiam pro I(acobo) A W(aes-
 senaer), cuius exemplar, postquam erit exscriptum, hoc est post unam aut
 75 alteram diem, ad ipsum²⁰ mittam.²¹ Ita facta est ut, si magnus aliquis fuis-

17 Although the chylous vessels (*venas lacteas*) had been discovered by the Paduan professor of medicine Gaspare Aselli (1581–1625) in 1622, when dissecting a living dog that had recently been fed, and its publication knew two editions in 1627 and 1628, the spread of the discovery appears to have been fairly slow (AUCANTE 1999, 609). But the third edition of Aselli's *De lactibus sive lacteis vasis quarto vasorum mesaraicorum genere ... dissertatio* by the Leiden printer Maire in 1640, put the question of chylous vessels high on the agenda, and probably induced Regius to add a corollary on it to his disputation. One of Aselli's conclusions is that these vessels have valves, which prevent the chyle from flowing back to the intestines.

18 Regius indeed dropped the corollary. From Descartes' letter to Mersenne of [30 July 1640] it is clear that meanwhile Descartes (and perhaps Regius too) performed several vivisections on dogs. Descartes confidently reiterates his view on chylous vessels: '... ie ne mets point de difference entre elles [blood and chylous vessels], sinon que le suc est blanc dans (les) lactées, a cause qu'elles n'ont point d'arteres qui les accompagne, et rouge dans les autres, a cause qu'il s'y mesle avec le sang qui vient des arteres' (AT III 141/CM IX 535). Regius makes the same distinction in REGIUS 1640B, 9–10 and in *Physiologia* IIa, 20 (Appendix, 213, ll. 21–27). According to Trevisani, the experiments referred to in the letter to Mersenne point to contacts between Descartes and Walaeus, which is, however, by no means certain (TREVISANI 1992, 245, n. 152). For the development of Descartes' view on chylous vessels, compare TREVISANI 1992, 242–244, and AUCANTE 1999, 608–613. See also D/R 20, ll. 5–9.

19 In traditional Galenic medicine the blood-vessel connecting the lungs and the right ventricle is called arterial vein (*vena arterialis*), the vessel connecting the lungs and the left ventricle venous artery (*arteria venosa*). Cf. SIEGEL 1968, 89–90. The discovery of the circulation of the blood rendered this terminology obsolete, and Descartes therefore noted in his *Discours* (AT VI 47) that the arterial vein is in fact an artery (the *pulmonary artery*), and the venous artery a vein (the *pulmonary vein*). Cf. *Physiologia* IIb, 25 (Appendix, 217, ll. 15–16).

20 *Ad ipsum*, that is, Van Waessenaer, and not Regius. The words are erroneously translated in AM and M as 'to you', as Bordoli remarks (B, 99). Baillet, relating that Descartes sent a copy of the judgement to Regius as well, makes the same mistake (*Vie*, II, 55, R/D 14A).

21 The ruling in the Stampioen-affair was issued on 24 May 1640 (cf. my commentary on R/D 6). The Leiden judges Golius and Van Schooten Sr favoured the solution of Van Waessenaer/Descartes over that of their

set condemnandus, non potuissent Iudices mitioribus verbis eius errores significare, sed nihilominus nullum verbum ex iis quae à W(aessenaer) scripta sunt, non approbant, et nullum verbum ex iis quae ab eius adversario, non condemnant. | [70]
389

80 Si quid sit de quo ampliorem explicationem desideres, paratum me semper invenies, ut seu scriptis seu verbis tibi serviam. Imò etiam, cum istae Theses disputabuntur, si velis, Ultraiectum excurram; sed modò nullus sciat, et in speculâ illâ, ex qua D^a à Schurmans solet audire lectiones, possim latere.²² Vale.

COMMENTARY

Date

In the penultimate paragraph of the letter, Descartes refers to the judgement in the Stampioen-affair rendered on 24 May 1640, which he received that very same day.

Text

The text actually belonging to Descartes' letter of 24 May 1640 is considerably shorter than the text of CLE and AT (AT no. 190). In AT, no. 190 consists of 20 paragraphs, which can be divided into four distinct parts. In paragraphs 1 to 4 Descartes deals with Regius' and Æmiliius' comments on the *Meditationes*. The second part, paragraphs 5 to 8, comprises several disjointed remarks on various topics. The third part, paragraphs 9 to 18, contains a detailed commentary on Regius' draft of his disputation on blood circulation (REGIUS 1640A). In the last part, paragraphs 19 and 20, Descartes mentions that the judgement in the Stampioen-affair has been pronounced, and finally some concluding remarks together with Descartes' proposal to attend Regius' imminent disputation on blood circulation.

Paragraphs 19 and 20 pertain without question to Descartes' letter of 24 May, indeed, they allow the letter to be dated.

On 5 [/15] May, Regius sent Descartes a draft of his disputation on blood circulation, with a request for comment (R/D 12B). In R/D 14B (20/30 May) the philosopher is thanked for his remarks. Since several of the remarks of part three of AT no. 190 reoccur verbatim in the published text of the disputation, this part also belongs to the letter of 24 May.

adversary Stampioen. The text of the judgement is printed in VAN WAESSENAER 1640, 81–86, and in STAMPIOEN 1640.

22 In his reply (R/D 14B) Regius invited Descartes to Utrecht, but there is no evidence that he actually witnessed the disputation. In a special box seat in the main auditorium Anna Maria van Schurman (see the *Biographical Lexicon*) was able to attend academic lectures without being noticed by the, exclusively male, students.

Paragraphs 1 to 4, however, concern Descartes' answer to R/D 14. I list them accordingly as D/R 15 (June 1640). Paragraphs 5 to 8 are fragments of three different letters from 1641, D/R 22, D/R 23 and D/R 27.

As a consequence, AT no. 190 is not one single letter but an amalgam of fragments of five different letters, only the second half of which, paragraphs 9 to 20, belongs to Descartes' letter of 24 May 1640.

Context

Regius' disputation Pro sanguinis circulatione (10/20 June 1640)

1. Opposition from within the University

As soon as the rector, Bernardus Schotanus, heard that Regius intended to defend the theory of the circulation of the blood, he went to see the professor of medicine and asked him not to submit a disputation on this controversial subject (NH, 14–15/*Querelle*, 87–88). When Regius refused to comply, the rector assembled the Senate, which after some discussion, decided that since the text was not printed yet, Regius should prepare another disputation on a more traditional subject, to which Harvey's speculations could be appended in a corollary, with the additional formula 'to be defended by way of exercise'. Regius promised to obey the decision, but when Schotanus examined the definitive text, no substantial changes had been made. The Senate took the matter up with the *curatores*, but in the mean time Regius had the text printed, and presented with this fait accompli the *curatores* decided to allow Regius to submit the disputation.

2. Contents

As the subject for his first disputation Regius chose the specimen of Descartes' method that appealed most to the Utrecht professor of medicine: the circulation of the blood and the movement of the heart. Not surprisingly, Regius' text closely follows Descartes' *Discours* (AT VI 46–54),²³ but he supplements it with the explanation of the blood's rarefaction by fermentation, which Descartes developed in his correspondence with Plemp (AT I 530–531). The rarefaction of the blood as the cause of the heart's movement constitutes the principal disagreement between Descartes and Harvey. According to Descartes, blood leaves the heart, due to its rapid rarefaction, during the diastole or expansion of the heart, whereas Harvey holds the (correct) view, that blood is driven from the heart into the arteries during the systole or the contraction of the heart.²⁴

The Cartesian explanation of blood circulation, the movement of the heart and respiration take up theses III to VIII in Regius' disputation. In the remaining theses, Regius cooked up something of his own. The first two theses, in which the manufacturing of food into blood is outlined, are largely Descartes' as well. The medical authority of the 16th century, Jean Fernel (1497–1558), distinguishes three kinds of concoction, the conversion of food into chyle in the stomach, the manufacturing of blood in the liver,

²³ See the notes to REGIUS 1640A in AT III 727–734.

²⁴ Recent studies on the divergent opinion on blood circulation and the working of the heart between Harvey/Walaeus and Descartes/Regius include FRENCH 1989, BITBOL-HESPÉRIÈS 1990, FUCHS 1992, GRENE 1993 and DESCARTES 2000, 245–255.

and the conversion of blood in the various parts of the body.²⁵ In Cartesian physiology, however, there is no qualitative distinction between these various kinds of concoction. Descartes urges Regius not to use traditional terminology (l. 1), and his proposal in ll. 7–21 is readily accepted by Regius, covering the larger part of the first two theses of the disputation.

The last theses, in which Regius presents a mechanistic account of respiration, make up for the lack of originality of the preceding paragraphs. In thesis IX he argues that inhalation does not result from any attractive power or a *fuga vacui* in the lungs, but from the muscular expansion of the chest outward which pushes the ambient air down into the lungs.²⁶ In the tenth thesis Regius distinguishes between voluntary and natural respiration. Natural respiration takes place whenever we do not actively control our breathing, e.g. in our sleep. This spontaneous movement of the muscles is regulated through a configuration of channels in the cerebral ventricle, controlling the influx of animal spirits through the nerves into the appropriate muscles.²⁷ Natural respiration thus works like a machine, comparable to the regular and reciprocal movements of a clock's pendulum, which solely depend on the configuration of its constituent parts, and the drive from a spring or weight.

It comes as no surprise that Descartes approved the definitive text of Regius' disputation. In July 1640 Descartes forwarded a copy of the disputation to his Paris correspondent:

Je vous envoie icy d'autres Theses, dans lesquelles on n'a rien du tout suivy que mes opinions, afin que vous sçachiez que s'il y en a qui les rejettent, il y en a aussi d'autres qui les embrassent. Peut-estre que quelques-uns de vos Medecins ne sont pas marris de voir ces Theses, et celui qui les a faites en prepare encore de semblables sur toute la Physiologie de la Medecine, et mesme, si ie luy voulois promettre assistance, sur toute le reste; mais ie ne la luy ose promettre, à cause qu'il y a mille choses que i'ignore; et ceux qui enseignent sont comme obligez de dire leur iugement de toutes choses.²⁸

²⁵ SHERRINGTON 1974, 69–73.

²⁶ This account of respiration came to be known as the 'Cartesian circle'. It has been attributed to Cornelis van Hogelande (VAN HOGELANDE 1646, cf. BERTHIER 1914, 62; for Van Hogelande, see the *Biographical Lexicon*) and Jan Swammerdam (1637–1680; SWAMMERDAM 1667, cf. BERTHIER 1914; 62, SWAMMERDAM 1975, 12–13; LINDEBOOM 1978, 73; LINDEBOOM 1984, 1923–1927), but credit should be given to Regius. The publication of his theory in REGIUS 1640A, *Physiologia* IIb and REGIUS 1646, did not escape notice; Thomas Bartholin corresponded on the subject with the French physician Abraham du Prat (1616–1660) in 1646 and with Regius himself in 1649 (BARTHOLIN 1740, I, 315–322, II, 423–428). When Regius rephrased his explanation of respiration in the draft of *Physiologia* IIb, Descartes proposed a modification, see D/R 22.

²⁷ Cf. GARIEPY 1990, 150. Descartes gives an identical account in *L'Homme* (AT XI 136–138), which work, although composed in the early 1630s, was published posthumously (see R/D 7, n. 4). Descartes never gave Regius a copy of the manuscript, but the Utrecht professor nevertheless secured a copy in 1646 (cf. AT IV 566–567/CM XIV 624). For his account of respiratory muscle-movement in REGIUS 1640A, Regius probably adapted Descartes' general explanation of muscle-movement in the *Dioptrique* (AT VI 109–112).

²⁸ Descartes to Mersenne, 22 July 1640, AT III 95–96/CM IX 492–493.

3. *The respondent Johannes Hayman*

The student who defended the theses in public was Johannes Hayman (c.1620–1666). Born in Zierikzee, Hayman attended Latin school at Vlissingen, and then moved to Utrecht to study medicine. He dedicated the disputation, among others, to Abraham Beeckman (1607–1663), a brother of Isaac Beeckman and rector of the Latin school at Vlissingen since 1636. According to Regius, Hayman defended the theses on blood circulation *cum magna laude*, even though he had been a medical student for only four months (REGIUS 1640B, 30). Cornelis Bruinvisch (on whom see 18, n. 6) composed a *carmen gratulatorium*, which was printed alongside the disputation.²⁹ Hayman matriculated at Leiden University on 10 May 1641, but he returned to Utrecht to defend the disputations *Physiologia* IIa–b in May/June 1641. After his studies — he appears to have graduated abroad — he settled in practice in Middelburg.³⁰

²⁹ The poem, which is not in AT, is printed on pp. [8–9] of the NLM copy of REGIUS 1640A. The same poem is in the NLM copy of the *Physiologia*, between *Physiologia* IIb and IIIa (published in GARIÉPY 1990, 236–237). Bruinvisch composed a poem for the respondent of the third disputation of REGIUS 1641B, Henricus van Loon, as well (printed behind the text of REGIUS 1641B-III).

³⁰ *Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 323. NNBW, III, 555–556; LINDEBOOM 1984, 799–800.

Regius to Descartes [Leiden]

20/30 May 1640

Vie, II, 55 [A], 59–60 [B], 103 [C] (no. 12).
AT, III, 71–72 (no. 191).

[A]

Ils¹ jugèrent en faveur de Waessenaer, et adjudgèrent les six cents livres de Stampioen aux pauvres. M. Descartes envoya aussitôt une copie de la sentence à M. Regius en lui marquant l'indulgence des juges, [*i.m.*: Tom. I. des Lettr. p. 388.²] mais qui nonobstant la douceur des termes qu'ils y avaient employés, n'avaient pas
5 laissé de faire connaître qu'ils approuvaient tout dans Waessenaer, et condamnaient tout dans Stampioen. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 12 de Reg. MS.]

[B]

Il [Regius] réforma ses thèses sur les remarques qu'il [Descartes] lui avait envoyées, et n'oublia pas surtout d'ôter le nom forgé de *Cartesius*, pour y remettre celui de *Descartes*, [*i.m.*: Page 387 du I vol.] comme il l'avait souhaité. Il lui récrivit le XX, c'est-à-dire le XXX de Mai, pour l'en remercier, et le prier instamment de
5 vouloir honorer ses thèses de sa présence. Ce qu'il croyait lui | devoir être d'autant 60 moins onéreux, qu'il le voyait sur le point de quitter le séjour de Leyde pour aller demeurer à Amersfoort, à trois petites lieues d'Utrecht.³ M. Descartes s'était offert le premier à ce voyage d'Utrecht, pour l'assister de plus près, s'il en était besoin; et pour entendre même la dispute de ses thèses, pourvu que l'on n'en sût rien,
10 [*i.m.*: Page. 389 initio *ibid.*⁴] et qu'il pût demeurer caché dans l'écoute ou la tribune de Mademoiselle de *Schurmans*. [*I.m.*: Anne Marie.] M. Regius lui promit [*i.m.*: Lettr. 12 de Reg. MS.] d'accomplir exactement ces conditions, et le supplia de vouloir être son hôte pendant le séjour qu'il ferait dans la ville, ajoutant que les

3 387] 187 *Vie* cf. D/R 13, ll. 82–84

1 The members of the jury in the Stampioen-affair, Golius and Van Schooten Sr (cf. my commentary on R/D 6).

2 D/R 13, ll. 73–79. Baillet's assumption that Descartes sent a copy of the judgement to Regius is based on a misinterpretation of the passage in D/R 13 referred to, see D/R 13, n. 20.

3 There is no other evidence that Descartes had any plans to live in Amersfoort, a city at 20 km north-east of Utrecht. But he may have visited his daughter Fransintgen there, who, according to Baillet, died in Amersfoort on 7 September 1640 (*Vie*, II, 90). If Descartes stayed in Amersfoort in May or June 1640, he quickly returned to Leiden, where his presence is attested for 11 June, 24 June and 31 July 1640 (AT III 88, 93, and ROTH 1926, 137/AT III 753).

4 D/R 13, ll. 81–84.

Fêtes de la Pentecôte avaient fait différer le jour des thèses jusqu'au 10/20 de Juin;
 15 mais que, la chose n'étant pas encore déterminée, il aurait soin de lui donner avis
 du jour fixé pour cela, dès qu'il l'aurait fait afficher.⁵

[C] (in continuation of R/D 12C)

Pour lui [Descartes] faire voir néanmoins que les grands éloges qu'ils [Regius
 and Æmilius] avaient donnés à cet ouvrage [*Meditationes*] ne devaient pas lui être
 suspects; ils lui proposèrent [*i.m.*: V. la fin de la letrr. 12 MS. de Regius.] deux
 difficultés touchant l'idée que nous avons de l'Être infini et infiniment parfait, et lui
 5 demandèrent un plus ample éclaircissement à ce qu'il en avait écrit dans son traité.
 M. Descartes leur accorda cette satisfaction avec plaisir,⁶ souhaitant de bon cœur
 qu'aux éloges près, les Docteurs de Sorbonne fissent le même jugement qu'eux de
 son traité.⁷

COMMENTARY

Date

According to Baillet, the letter is dated 20 May (OS) or 30 May (NS), which date is confirmed by two notes in the *ExI* (see my commentary on R/D 12).

5 The disputation (REGIUS 1640A) was submitted on 10/20 June, as scheduled. In 1640, Pentecost — in the Julian calendar — fell on 24 May. The academic Whitsun holiday lasted from 21 till 27 May.

6 See D/R 15.

7 This last statement is entirely Baillet's view. In the paragraph preceding the selection of R/D 14C, Baillet quotes the letter to Mersenne, in which Descartes proposes to submit his *Meditationes* for approval to the theologians of the Sorbonne (*Vie*, II, 102–103). The letter in question is, however, of a later date than R/D 14, viz. 30 September 1640 (AT III 184/CM X 116). It is generally held that the *Meditationes* did not receive the Sorbonne's approbation; for a different view, see ARMOGATHE 1994. In any case, the claim on the title page *cum approbatione doctorum* was dropped in the second edition (Amsterdam 1642).

15
Descartes [Leiden] to Regius
[June 1640]

CLE, I, 384–385, (no. 81-I).
AT, III, 63–65 (no. 190-I).
AM, IV, 57–60; RL, 23–24; CSMK, 146–148; B, 91–93.

Vir Clarissime,

Multùm me vobis devinxistis, tu et Clar. D. Æmilius, scriptum quod ad vos miseram examinando et emendando.¹ Video enim vos etiam interpunctiones et orthographiae vitia corrigere non fuisse dedignatos; 5 sed magis me adhuc devinxissetis, si quid etiam in verbis sententiisque ipsis mutare voluissetis. Nam quantulumcunque illud fuisset, spem ex eo concepissem ea quae reliquissetis minùs esse vitiosa; nunc vereor ne istud non sitis aggressi, quia nimis multa vel fortè omnia fuissent delenda. [64]

10 Quantùm ad obiectiones, in primâ dicitis: *ex eo quod in nobis sit aliquid sapientiae, potentiae, bonitatis, quantitatis etc., nos formare ideam infinitae vel saltem indefinitae sapientiae, potentiae, bonitatis, et aliarum perfectionum quae Deo tribuuntur, ut etiam ideam infinitae quantitatis*; quod totum libens concedo, et planè mihi persuadeo non 15 esse aliam in nobis ideam Dei, quam quae hoc pacto formatur. Sed tota vis mei argumenti est, quod contendam me non posse esse talis naturae ut illas perfectiones, quae minutae in me sunt, possim cogitando in infinitum extendere, nisi originem nostram haberemus ab Ente, in quo actu reperiantur infinitae; ut neque ex inspectione exiguae quantitatis, sive 20 corporis finiti, possem concipere quantitatem indefinitam, nisi mundi etiam magnitudo esset vel saltem esse posset indefinita.²

In secunda dicitis: *axiomatum clarè et distinctè intel- | lectorum 385 veritatem per se esse manifestam*; quod etiam concedo, quandiu clarè et

2 Clar. D. Æmilius CLE (1663) Cl. D. F. CLE (1657)

1 A manuscript of Descartes' *Meditationes*. Cf. R/D 12, n. 6.

2 Cf. the Third Meditation, AT VII 45–47/CSM II 31–32. The objection is repeated by Gassendi in the Fifth Set of Objections (AT VII 287/CSM II 200). The divergence of opinions between Descartes and Regius in metaphysical issues surface in these objections. Regius rejects Descartes' notion that the idea of God — or any idea for that matter — is innate. Instead, Regius argues that all ideas, including our idea of God without the aid of Divine revelation, are the product of experience, as in the objection above, or of tradition (REGIUS 1646, 252).

distinctè intelliguntur, quia mens nostra est talis naturae, ut non possit
 25 clarè intellectis non assentiri; sed quia saepè recordamur conclusionum
 ex talibus praemissis deductarum, etiamsi ad ipsas praemissas non at-
 tendamus, dico tunc, si Deum ignoremus, fingere nos posse illas esse
 incertas, quantumvis recordemur ex claris principiis esse deductas; quia
 nempe talis forte sumus naturae, ut fallamur etiam in evidentissimis; [65]
 30 ac proindè, ne tunc quidem, cum illas ex istis principiis deduximus,
 scientiam, sed tantum persuasionem, de illis nos habuisse. Quae duo ita
 distinguo, ut persuasio sit, cum superest aliqua ratio quae nos possit ad
 dubitandum impellere; scientia vero sit persuasio à ratione tam forti, ut
 nullâ unquam fortiore concuti possit; qualem nullam habent qui Deum
 35 ignorant. Qui autem semel clarè intellexit rationes quae persuadent
 Deum existere, illumque non esse fallacem, etiamsi non amplius ad
 illas attendat, modo tantum recordetur huius conclusionis: *Deus non*
est fallax, remanebit in eo non tantum persuasio, sed vera scientia tum
 huius, tum etiam aliarum omnium conclusionum quarum se rationes
 40 clarè aliquando percepisse recordabitur.³

Dicis etiam in tuis ultimis⁴ (quae heri receptae, me, ut simul ad
 praecedentes⁵ responderem, monuerunt): *omnem praecipitantiam in-*
tempestivi iudicij pendere ab ipso corporis temperamento, tum ac-
*quisito, tum innato;*⁶ quod nullomodò possum admittere, quia sic tollere-
 45 tur libertas, et amplitudo⁷ nostrae voluntatis, quae potest istam praecip-
 itantiam emendare; vel, si non faciat, error inde ortus privatio quidem
 est respectu nostri, sed respectu Dei mera negatio.⁸

3 Cf. the Fifth Meditation, AT VII 69–70/CSM II 47–48, and the Second Set of Objections and Replies, AT VII 125, 141/CSM II 89, 101.

4 We should supply *litteris*, not *obiectionibus* as some translators do (AM IV 60; CSMK, 148; B, 93). The letter in question is lost and does not seem to have been part of the collection known to Baillet.

5 R/D 14.

6 Regius' mechanistic account of (*bona*) *temperies* is outlined in *Physiologia* Ia–b, 4–14 (Appendix, 201–209); cf. GARIEPY 1990, 128–132. His views on judgment and the will in *Physiologia* IIIb, 43–45 (Appendix, 234–236); cf. GARIEPY 1990, 160–161.

7 Descartes' source for the concept of the will's *amplitudo* is the French Oratorian Guillaume Gibieuf (1583–1650). Cf. FERRIER 1973 and FERRIER 1976, II, 'Pour une métaphysique de Gibieuf. Rapports avec Descartes'.

8 Cf. the Fourth Meditation, AT VII 60–61/CSM II 41–42.

COMMENTARY

Date

D/R 15 is Descartes' reply to two letters by Regius. Regius' first letter contained two objections by Æmilius and himself after reading the manuscript of the *Meditationes*. In the second letter (*dicis in tuis ultimis [litteris]*, l. 41) Regius submitted a third objection. Baillet reports that R/D 14 (20/30 May 1640) contained the first two objections of Regius and Æmilius (R/D 14C). This has to be the first letter Descartes reacts to. Regius' second letter is lost; the next letter mentioned by Baillet dates from 7 October 1640, which is obviously too late. We should probably place the lost letter in June 1640. Since Descartes replied immediately (cf. ll. 41–42), D/R 15 must date from the same month.

Text

Clerselier printed D/R 15 as the first part of a larger text, which at first sight appears to be one single letter. In AT, the document is dated 24 May 1640 (AT no. 190), and Adam and Tannery need therefore explain the discrepancy between on the one hand Descartes' replying to Regius' and Æmilius' objections on 24 May, and on the other hand Baillet's indication that these objections are found in R/D 14 (20/30 May). They solve the problem by postulating the existence of one or two other letters containing the objections between R/D 12 (5 [15] May) and Descartes' answer of 24 May. Baillet would thus be mistaken: according to Adam and Tannery, in R/D 14 Regius may only show appreciation for Descartes' replies (cf. AT III 72).

Adam and Tannery's conjecture would be plausible if AT no. 190 were one single letter, however, the text presented by Clerselier is an amalgam consisting of (fragments of) no less than five letters. In the commentary on D/R 13, I argued that only the second half of AT no. 190 dates from 24 May 1640. The part between D/R 13 and the first four paragraphs of AT no. 190 which constitute D/R 15, is made up of three fragments dating from 1641, D/R 22, D/R 23, and D/R 27. The only indication for the date of D/R 15 is given by Baillet, who refers to R/D 14 when mentioning Regius' and Æmilius' objections. The sequence of events, therefore, seems to be as follows. On 5 [15] May Regius thanked Descartes, also on Æmilius' behalf, for sending the manuscript of the *Meditationes* (R/D 12C). On 20/30 May Regius returned the manuscript complete with his and Æmilius' notes and two objections (R/D 14C). Shortly thereafter, Regius proposed a third objection, which reminds Descartes that he owed his Utrecht friends a reply to the first two objections as well (D/R 15).

Regius to Descartes [Leiden]

7 October 1640 [NS?]

Vie, II, 62 [A], 63–64 [B] (no. 13).
AT, III, 202–203 (no. 209).

[A]

Pour revenir aux thèses de M. Regius, nous ne savons ni en quel jour du mois de Juin précisément elles furent soutenues, ni même si M. Descartes y assista.¹ Mais nous savons que leur grand succès déplut beaucoup à Voetius, et que les médecins de la vieille doctrine en murmurèrent un peu. Primerose, l'un d'entre eux, [...] entreprit
5 de réfuter ces thèses de M. Regius; [*i.m.*: Narrat. hist. Acad. Ultraj.² Item. lettr. XIV de Reg.³] et l'on vit paraître peu de temps après son écrit imprimé à Leyde, où il attaquait principalement le dogme de la *circulation du sang*.⁴ M. Regius en eut avis dès la fin du mois d'Août, et il prépara aussitôt une réponse à ce nouvel adversaire, qui, non content de l'avoir voulu réfuter, avait jugé à propos de le charger encore
10 d'injures. Une conduite si malhonnête lui avait échauffé la bile, et sans songer qu'un homme sage ne doit point pécher par exemple, il avait employé dans sa réponse tantôt l'aigreur, tantôt la plaisanterie, lorsqu'il n'était question que d'une réfutation sérieuse et modérée.

Il envoya cette réponse à M. Descartes le VII d'Octobre suivant [*i.m.*: Lettr. XIII
15 de Regius.] pour la lui faire corriger; et il tâcha de s'excuser auprès de lui sur la dureté des expressions, sous prétexte que le style mordant de Primerose lui avait donné trop d'indignation; et de lui faire agréer qu'il eût pris le parti de la raillerie en divers endroits, pour répondre à quelques impertinences de cet auteur.⁵

[B]

Les Curateurs de l'Université d'Utrecht, sollicités par Voetius, Dematius, et quelques autres Professeurs, de remédier aux troubles qu'ils feignaient que les

1 See R/D 14B. There is no evidence that Descartes actually attended the disputation.

2 NH, 15/*Querelle*, 88.

3 Reference to R/D 18A.

4 PRIMROSE 1640.

5 Regius also showed the response to his colleagues Voetius, Dematius and Lyraeus, who advised him to confine himself to the issue at hand and to refrain from sarcasm (NH, 15/*Querelle*, 88, cf. R/D 18A). Regius' response, entitled 'A sponge to wipe out the filth of Primrose's reproaches' (REGIUS 1640B), was printed in Leiden by W. Christiaens for J. Maire. In October 1640, the printer Christiaens finished printing for Maire VAN WAESSENAER 1640 (cf. AT III 200), which project Descartes supervised (see my commentary on R/D 6). It seems plausible that Descartes monitored the printing of REGIUS 1640B as well.

thèses et les opinions singulières de M. Regius commençaient à exciter parmi eux, avaient publié une ordonnance pour empêcher d'introduire des nouveautés
 5 ou des maximes contraires aux statuts de l'Université.⁶ La chose était assez équivoque. C'est ce qui porta M. Descartes à la démêler, et à faire une explication de l'ordonnance des Curateurs en forme de réponse. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 13 de Regius.] | Monsieur Vander-Hoolck, l'un des Magistrats de la ville, qui fut même
 10 fort belle et fort judicieuse; et il goûta merveilleusement le dessein qu'avait M. Descartes de laisser continuer M. Regius d'enseigner la Philosophie nouvelle, en se contentant de modérer son zèle, et de réformer ce qu'il y aurait de trop hardi dans ses opinions. M. Regius lui avait envoyé divers petits écrits sur différents sujets de physique, auxquels il avait satisfait très ponctuellement, quoi qu'il fût
 15 alors occupé de beaucoup d'autres affaires. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 13 de Reg. MSS.]

64

COMMENTARY

Date

The date of the letter, 7 October 1640, is found in Baillet and in two notes in the *ExI*. The calendar used cannot be determined with certainty, but as both hands in the *ExI* give the same date, it is probably the Gregorian calendar.⁸

Text

In AT, the selection R/D 16A from Baillet's *Vie* continues with an additional sentence:

M. Descartes usa de son droit d'autant plus volontiers que M. Regius l'avertissait qu'il y allait de son intérêt. [*i.m.*: Page. 389 tom. I des Lettr.]

I omit the sentence because the letter referred to, D/R 26, has no bearing on Regius' reply to Primrose at all. D/R 26 indisputably dates from the autumn of 1641. Descartes' answer to R/D 16 being lost, his comments on the text of REGIUS 1640B remain unknown.

⁶ None of the events Baillet describes seems to have actually taken place (see my commentary). In 1640 the university had as yet no statutes — they were formulated and approved by the Vroedschap in August 1643. They stated explicitly that only Aristotelian philosophy was to be taught (*Resolutiën*, 172, 184). The States of Utrecht refused to pass the statutes unless sections dealing with the *forum academicum*, which granted the university Senate their own jurisdiction, were dropped (*Resolutiën*, 170–174, 195–199). The revised statutes passed in March 1644. Cf. MULLER 1914.

⁷ Cf. D/R 28, l. 57.

⁸ See my Introduction, *xli*.

*Context**Text A: the polemic between Regius and Primrose*

James Primrose (1598–1659), the son of a Scottish preacher who fled to France for religious motives, studied at the universities of Bordeaux and Paris.⁹ In 1617 he graduated in Medicine at the University of Montpellier. Having completed his studies, he went to England and in the 1630s settled in Hull. Primrose declared himself an ardent opponent of the circulation of the blood. He vehemently attacked not only Harvey (PRIMROSE 1630), but anyone who supported Harvey's opinions. Walaeus' disputation *pro* blood circulation evoked a prompt answer by Primrose.¹⁰ Regius sent a copy of his disputation to Primrose, and if this was an attempt to provoke a polemic, it was successful. It took the English physician just six hours to compose a response, which consists of the complete text of Regius' theses, each thesis followed by Primrose's refutation.¹¹ Primrose wrote a reply to REGIUS 1640B as well, but he had to wait till 1644 to see it published: the ship carrying the manuscript to the Netherlands was captured by Dunkirk pirates.¹²

Text B

Of the events related by Baillet in R/D 16B, the following are not recorded for the autumn of 1640 but in 1642: 1. prompted by the academic Senate, the *curatores* publish a decree against the New Philosophy; 2. Descartes composes a response to defend Regius; 3. Van der Hoolck, quite pleased with the response, intends to get Regius to continue his Cartesian lectures. Apart from Baillet, no source mentions a crisis over Cartesianism in the second half of 1640. Nothing was published against the teaching of anti-Aristotelian ideas, nor did Descartes write a response to such a publication. Events reminiscent of these did happen, though, in early 1642. Perhaps the common keyword in both R/D 16 and the letters of early 1642, a 'response' by Regius to an adversary, lies at the bottom of Baillet's confusion. In both cases Regius sent Descartes the draft of a response, in October 1640 his reply to Primrose, and in early 1642 the reply to Voetius (REGIUS 1642).¹³

Adam and Tannery as well as Bordoli point to the troubles relating to Regius' first disputation in June 1640 in order to explain the contents of R/D 16B (see above, p. 46). In his letter, Regius may very well have mentioned the opposition he encountered at the time, but it cannot account for the specific details in Baillet's story.

9 For Primrose see DNB, 46, 381–382; BLA, 4, 675–676, and SCHOUTEN/GOLTZ 1977.

10 WALAEUS 1640 (facsimile in SCHOUTEN 1972). PRIMROSE 1640A.

11 'Postea D. Le Roy etiam quaedam circa haec ludicra meditatus est, quae mentem meam exploraturus ad me transmisit. Cui eadem die intra horas sex hoc responsum dedi, quamvis eorum quae scripsit probaverit nihil', PRIMROSE 1640B, *Praefatio* (cited from ISRAËLS/DANIËLS 1883, 60).

12 PRIMROSE 1644. Primrose's life-long battle against the theory of blood circulation is analysed in SCHOUTEN/GOLTZ 1977. For the Regius–Primrose debate in particular, see ISRAËLS/DANIËLS 1883, 60–63; DE VRIJER 1917, 214–215; SCHOUTEN/GOLTZ 1977, 345–350.

13 For Descartes' involvement in Regius' response to Voetius, see D/R 31 and D/R 33. Van der Hoolck's (negative) assessment of Descartes' outline of the response is recorded in R/D 32A. Finally, in March 1642 the Vroedschap approved the publication of the Senate's judgement of the *Responsio* (REGIUS 1642), which included a ban of the New Philosophy (see my commentary on R/D 37).

17
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[April 1641]

CLE, I, 429 (no. 96).
AT, IV, 239–240 (no. 387).
AM, VI, 253–254; RL, 126–129; B, 239–241.

Vir Clarissime,

Nescio quid obstiterit, cur non prius ad tuas responderim, nisi quod, ut verum fatear, non libenter à te dissentiam.¹ Et quia non videbar in eo quod scribebas debere assentiri, idcirco cunctantiùs calamum assumebam. Mirabar enim te illa, quae horariae disputationis examini committere non auderes, indelebilibus typis credere velle, magisque vereri extemporaneas et inconsideratas adversariorum tuorum criminationes, quam attentas et longo studio excogitatas. Cumque meminerim me multa legisse in tuo compendio Physico, à vulgari opinione planè aliena, quae nudè ibi proponuntur, nullis additis rationibus, quibus lectori probabilia reddi possint, toleranda quidem illa esse putavi in Thesibus, ubi saepe paradoxa colliguntur, ad ampliorem disputandi materiam [240] adversariis dandam; sed in libro, quem tanquam novae Philosophiae Prodigium videbaris velle proponere, planè contrarium iudico esse faciendum: nempe rationes esse afferendas, quibus lectori persuadeas quae vis concludere vera esse, priusquam ipsa exponas, ne novitate suâ illum offendant. Sed iam audio à D. Van S(urck)² te consilium mutasse, multòque magis probo id quod nunc suscipis, nempe Theses de Physiologia in ordine ad Medicinam;³ has enim et firmiùs stabilire, et 20 commodiùs defendere te posse confido, et minus facilè de ipsis malè loquendi occasionem adversarij tui reperient. Vale.

11 probabilia AT] probabiles CLE 19 Physiologia] Physiologia CLE 20 defendere] deffendere CLE

1 In the Clerselier collection there is no trace of the letter meant. In the letter, Regius apparently disclosed his plan to publish his work in physics, a precursor of the New Philosophy (ll.13–14 below; cf. my commentary on R/D 12).

2 On Anthony Studler van Surck, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

3 In April 1641, Regius indeed commenced a series of medical disputations entitled *Physiologia sive cognitio sanitatis* (REGIUS 1641A), which project covered most of the correspondence in 1641 (see my commentary on R/D 18).

COMMENTARY

Date and context

Against the date proposed by Adam and Tannery, Verbeek has argued convincingly that the letter cannot date from July 1645. Verbeek's acceptable alternative is April 1641.⁴

In D/R 17, Descartes asks Regius to reconsider his plan to publish a book; he would rather have Regius discussing his ideas in disputations. The *ExI*, followed by Adam and Tannery, considers D/R 17 to be Descartes' reply to Regius' letter of [13/] 23 June 1645 (R/D 55), thus assuming that the book in question is REGIUS 1646.⁵ The traditional view is corroborated by the first lines of Descartes' subsequent letter (D/R 57), in which he repeats the point of a preceding letter, namely that Regius' method of presenting his ideas is only acceptable in disputations.

Verbeek, however, argues that the traditional date cannot be correct. By 1645, Regius had publicly discussed his ideas many times, whereas Descartes suggests that Regius did not have the courage to defend his philosophy in a disputation (ll. 5–6). Moreover, Regius' book is said to be a precursor (*Prodromus*, l. 14) of the New Philosophy, whereas Descartes had published his own *Principia* in 1644. Finally, mention is made of a change of plans, resulting in Regius discussing 'physiology in relation to medicine', which suggests a theoretical approach, whereas Regius' 1645 disputations all deal with practical medicine.⁶

The allusion to a change of plans — the decision not to publish a textbook on physics but to submit theses on 'physiology in relation to medicine' instead — is the key to fix a new date. Verbeek points to a course of events in the spring of 1641 that correspond to the change of plans mentioned. Early in 1641, Regius went to visit Voetius. He showed him his work on physiology, and he asked Voetius whether it could be published without affronting theologians. Voetius pointed out some passages that might be harmful to the teaching of theology, but he also replied that he did not wish to assume authority in medical matters, and that Regius should take care not to offend his colleagues.⁷ Shortly thereafter, after his appointment as rector of the university, on 16/26 March 1641, Voetius received another visit of Regius who informed him of his plans to publish his philosophy. He would like to know what Voetius thought best: to publish a book or to submit disputations. Voetius preferred that Regius would publish a book, probably because this would not commit the university. Regius, however, insisted on having disputations, and Voetius then suggested that they should not be philosophical — Senguerd, the professor of philosophy, might resent this as an intrusion of his domain — but medical: 'This would allow [Regius] to integrate into his text, either in the form

⁴ *Querelle*, 451–452, n. 41; VERBEEK 1993B, 6–7; VERBEEK 1994, 539–540.

⁵ *ExI*, I, 429, *in margine*: 'La missive de Mr le Roy est du 13 juin 1645, p. 70. La reponse de Mr le Roy est du 6^e Juillet 1645, p. 71' (the note was canceled but it is still legible). A second note on an inserted leaflet reads: 'La 96 lettre du I Vol. est de M. D. a M. Reg. Elle repond a la 32e de Reg. datée du 23 Juin 1645 [...] la reponse de M. R. a cette lettre est du 6^e juillet 1645'.

⁶ In 1645, Regius started an exhaustive series of disputations on the treatment of all sorts of diseases, afterwards collected in REGIUS 1657B.

⁷ NH, 16–18/*Querelle*, 88–90; cf. *Epistola ad Voetium*, AT VIII B 29. Regius had Descartes tackle at least one of Voetius' objections, see R/D 18B and D/R 19B.

of corollaries or as part of the theses, his own opinions on the first part of medicine, which is physiology.⁸ Regius followed Voetius' advice and he initiated, on 17/27 April, a series of medical disputations entitled *Physiologia sive cognitio sanitatis* (REGIUS 1641A).⁹ In the present letter, Descartes seems to approve of the outcome of Regius' meeting with Voetius: 'I hear that you have changed your mind, and I wholeheartedly approve of your decision to embark on theses on physiology in relation to medicine.' (ll. 17–19). As a result, Verbeek proposes to date the letter April 1641, between 26 March and 27 April.¹⁰

It remains to be explained why Regius changed his mind. Perhaps he did because he realised he could have it both ways: he would submit disputations, but have them printed as a book, so the collected disputations would form a coherent unity, perhaps not the precursor Regius had hoped for but nonetheless a specimen of the New Philosophy.

⁸ NH, 18/*Querelle*, 90.

⁹ Regius' *Physiologia* consists of three series of three disputations. The disputations in the first series, *Physiologia* I–III, each have two parts, which were defended separately between 17/27 April and 30 June/10 July 1641. The second series (*Physiologia* IV–VI) commenced after the summer recess, and were submitted in September, on [10/20] November and finally on 15/25 December 1641. The project was brought to an end only in 1643, with the defence of the last three disputations (*Physiologia* VII–IX) on 25 March OS, 13/23 May and in June. The texts of *Physiologia* I–III and a part of *Physiologia* VI, which are the most interesting disputations from a philosophical and medical point of view, are found in the Appendix.

¹⁰ Verbeek does not consider the possibility that D/R 17 dates from the spring of 1640, when Regius turned his thoughts to publishing his physics as well, but eventually chose to submit a disputation (cf. R/D 12B). The change of plans in D/R 17, however, does not seem to refer to this episode. First, because the description 'theses on physiology in relation to medicine' sounds more ambitious than a single disputation on blood circulation. Second, Regius' reluctance to submit disputations, as shown in D/R 17, may indicate a previous experience, the disputation on blood circulation of June 1640.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

21 April [/1 May] 1641

Vie, II, 62–63 [A], 140 [B], 141 [C], 142 [D] (no. 14).
 AT, III, 366–367 [B, C, D] (no. 238–I).

[A]

Monsieur | Regius voulant marquer qu'il ne voulait aussi rien faire que du con- 63
 sentement et de l'avis de ses collègues, communiqua sa réponse¹ à ceux d'entre
 eux qu'il savait sur tout n'être pas si bien intentionnés pour lui que les autres.
 Il la fit voir à Voetius, à Liraeus, et à Charles de Maets, dit *Dematius*, l'un des
 5 Professeurs en théologie, qui se contentèrent de lui dire de traiter simplement
 son sujet, et de retrancher ce qui pourrait s'y trouver de piquant et de railleur.
 Ces Messieurs appellent cet adversaire *Primerosius*, comme fait aussi M. Regius.²
 [*I.m.*: Narrat. hist. pag. 15. Reg. Epist. 14.]

[B]

Le Recteur charmé de la déférence et des honnêtetés de M. Regius, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 14
 de Regius. MS. à Desc.] qui lui avait apporté ses thèses à corriger, se contenta d'y
 faire quelques remarques pour sauver l'honneur de la philosophie ancienne [...].³

[C]

M. Regius, pour défendre ses sentiments contre la médisance et les vers satyriques
 de ses envieux, jugea à propos de faire imprimer une exposition simple de cette
 première dispute.⁴ Il en écrivit le XXI d'Avril à M. Descartes pour l'informer

1 Regius' reply to Primrose (REGIUS 1640B).

2 The marginal reference to R/D 18 accounts solely for Regius mentioning Primrose in his letter. All other information in the passage is derived from NH, 15/*Querelle*, 88. Perhaps Regius commented on the misfortune that befell on Primrose's proposed response to him (see my commentary on R/D 16).

3 Regius showed Voetius his *Physiologia* before he submitted the text, asking the theologian if there were any points that were in conflict with Calvinist doctrine (see my commentary on D/R 17). Voetius marked out some points that could harm the theological programme, but he did not wish to judge any medical opinion. The first disputation *Physiologia* Ia, *De sanitate, pars prior* took place on 17/27 April, the respondent being Johannes de Raey. Four days later, Regius wrote Descartes R/D 18, and sent him the printed text of the disputation along with the drafts of *Physiologia* Ib and *Physiologia* IIIa–b. Descartes discusses one of Voetius' remarks in D/R 19, ll. 37–45.

4 Regius' abandoned his plan to publish 'une exposition simple'. NH records that Regius' 1641 disputations were particular rowdy events. Moreover, both parties distributed satirical poems (NH, 19/*Querelle*, 91). None of these satirical poems, of which only a small number were printed, have been preserved. Descartes refers to two poems in the *Epistola ad Voetium*, AT VIII B 32, and *Lettre apologétique*, AT VIII B 235–236 (cf. BOS 1999B, 422). Three laudatory poems for Regius' respondents Hayman (see my commentary on D/R 13), Petrus Pueteman (REGIUS 1641B-II), and Henricus van Loon (REGIUS 1641B-III) are printed behind the texts of the disputations. The last two poems, by I. Camp and Cornelis Bruinvisch, overtly call for combatting and purging traditional philosophy.

de toutes choses, et pour lui marquer que ces oppositions ne servaient qu'à lui
 5 augmenter le courage avec lequel il espérait soutenir les efforts des adversaires de
 leur philosophie commune. Mais pour lui faire sentir les besoins qu'il avait de
 son secours, il lui donna avis que la plus grande partie de l'Université se soulevait
 contre lui par les pratiques de Voetius, qui prétendait employer le crédit de son
 Rectorat à la ruine du Cartésianisme. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 14 MS. de Reg.] Il lui exagéra
 10 surtout la fierté du jeune Voetius, Maître-ès-Arts,⁵ qui ne manquait pas d'esprit,
 mais que l'autorité de son père semblait avoir rendu insolent dans les accusations
 fausses et ridicules dont il avait prétendu le charger.

Il lui envoya en même temps la suite des thèses qu'il devait encore faire le v
 jour de Mai, avec les remarques que le Recteur y avait faites avant que de les lui
 15 passer.

[D]

Les secondes thèses, soutenues le 5 de Mai, n'eurent pas moins d'éclat que les
 premières, et elles ne firent pas moins de peine aux Professeurs de philosophie, de
 médecine et de mathématique, auxquels Voetius voulut persuader que Regius avait
 juré la ruine de la philosophie qu'ils professaient, et qu'il sapait les fondements de
 5 leurs connaissances.⁶ Après les disputes de physiologie, il en eût d'autres dans le
 cours de l'été touchant les opérations de l'esprit, touchant les passions de l'âme, la
 substance, la quantité, le mouvement, et sur les principales questions de médecine.
 [*I.m.*: Lettr. 14 MS. de Reg.]

5 Paulus Voet graduated on 29 June/9 July 1640 in philosophy and the arts (VOET 1640). On 24 May 1641 OS, he was appointed associate professor of metaphysics (*Resolutiën*, 154).

6 The second disputation, *Physiologia Ib, De sanitate, pars posterior*, was defended by Cornelis Bruinvisch (c.1623–1652). Baillet's *Vie* is the only source for the date of the disputation, 5 May, without indication of the calendar used. However, as 25 April/5 May was Easter Sunday, the precise date of the disputation needs to be 5/15 May. Bruinvisch pursued his studies not in medicine but in theology. He defended several theological disputations for Meinardus Schotanus and Voetius in 1642 and 1643; the latter are specifically directed against Cartesianism (POSTMA 1980, 79–80. VOETIUS 1648–1669, I, 808–868). He became a minister, first at Zuidland (1645) and finally at Zierikzee in 1650 (VAN LIEBURG 1996, 41).

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 21 April 1641, without indication of the calendar used. According to the *ExI*, the exact date is 21 April/1 May 1641.⁷ Another indication that the date is indeed 21 April OS, is the fact that in text C Regius relates the reaction of his opponents to the disputation *Physiologia* Ia, which took place on 17 April OS.⁸

Text

My presentation of R/D 18 differs from AT in two respects. First, another selection from Baillet's *Vie* is added, text A, because it contains a reference to Regius' letter 14 in the Clerselier collection.

Second, I omit a passage added by Adam and Tannery to text B, because it is not connected to any of Regius' letters:

La première dispute publique de ces thèses se fit le XVII jour d'Avril de l'an 1641. M. Regius y présidait; et celui qui la soutenait sous lui était le jeune Monsieur *de Raey*, qui s'est rendu depuis fort célèbre par ses écrits et son savoir, et qui est encore aujourd'hui au nombre des vivants.⁹

There is no reference to Regius' letter in the passage. Baillet probably retrieved the date of the disputation from NH, and the respondent's name from D/R 19B (l. 1).

The third difference concerns text D. In AT the selection concludes with a passage where Baillet refers to Regius' letter 15 in the Clerselier collection. I have placed this fragment in its proper context, i.e. R/D 30 ([14/] 24 February 1642).

⁷ *ExI*, I, 392, in the margin of letter no. 84 (which I divide in D/R 19B and D/R 20): 'Celle cy sert de reponse a celle de Mr le Roy du 21^e Avril 1641'. A note on an inserted leaflet reads: 'La 84e du I Vol. p. 392 est de M. Desc. a M. le Roy, c'est une reponse a une lettre de M. le Roy datée du 21^e Avril/1 May 1641'.

⁸ The date of the disputation is found in NH, 18/*Querelle*, 90. In 1641, Easter fell on 25 April (Julian calendar), so the disputation was submitted on a Saturday, the last day before the Easter holiday of the university.

⁹ *Vie*, II, 140.

19 A
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[early May 1641]

CLE, I, 396 (no. 85).
AT, III, 369–370 (no. 239).
AM, IV, 344–345; RL, 34–37; M, 352–353; CSMK, 181; B, 113–115.

Vir Clarissime,

Tota nostra controversia de *anima triplici*, magis est de nomine quam de re.

5 Sed primò, quia Romano-Catholico non licet dicere *animam* in homine esse *triplicem*, vereorque ne mihi homines imputent quod in tuis thesibus ponis, mallet ab isto loquendi modo abstineas.¹

2. Etsi *vis vegetandi et sentiendi* in brutis sint actus primi, non [370] tamen idem sunt in homine, quia *mens* prior est, saltem dignitate.

3. Etsi ea quae sub aliqua generali ratione conveniunt, possint à
10 logicis tanquam eiusdem generis partes poni, omnis tamen eiusmodi generalis ratio non est verum genus; nec bona est divisio nisi veri generis in veras species, et quamvis partes debeant esse oppositae ac diversae, ut tamen bona sit divisio, non debent partes à se mutuo nimium distare.² Nam si quis, exempli causa, totum humanum corpus in duas
15 partes distingueret, in quarum unâ solum nasum, et in aliâ caetera omnia membra poneret, peccaret ista divisio, ut tua, quod partes essent nimis inaequales.

4. Non admitto *vim vegetandi et sentiendi* in brutis mereri *animae* appellationem, ut *mens* illam meretur in homine; sed vulgus ita voluisse,
20 quia ignoravit bruta *mente* carere, atque idcirco *animae* nomen esse aequivocum, respectu hominis et brutorum.³

5. Denique,⁴

⁴ Sed ... in CLE, D/R 19A is not divided into paragraphs

¹ See 19B, n. 2. All four points raised in D/R 19A, the draft of Descartes' letter, are repeated in the final version of the letter, D/R 19B, ll. 10–30.

² In his draft of *Physiologia* Ib, Regius seems to have conceived the soul as a genus consisting of the species mind, vegetative power and animal locomotive power, see below, D/R 19B, ll. 10–17.

³ For Descartes' deliberate choice of the term *mens* over *anima*, which Regius accepted, see FOWLER 1999, 161–186, 356. In his discussion of D/R 19, Fowler notes that in Descartes' estimation, the centuries old dispute about the plurality of the soul was based on the equivocal use of *anima*, and neatly solved by replacing it by the word *mens*, thus signalling the elimination of all 'soul functions' below that of *cogitatio* (FOWLER 1999, 315–320). Cf. ROTHSCUH 1968, 54.

⁴ Clerselier adds: *Deest reliquum*.

19 B
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[early May 1641]

CLE, I, 392–395 (no. 84–I).
AT, III, 371–374 (no. 240–I).
AM, IV, 346–351; RL, 38–42; M, 353–356; CSMK, 181–183 (partly); B, 115–118.

Vir Clarissime,

Queri sane non possum de tua et Domini de Raey humanitate, quod
meum nomen vestris thesibus praemittere volueritis;¹ sed neque etiam
scio qua ratione à me gratiae vobis agenda sint; et tantum video novum
5 opus mihi imponi, quod nempe homines inde sint credituri, meas opi-
niones à vestris non dissentire, atque adeo ab iis quae asseruistis, pro
viribus defendendis, me imposterùm excusare non debeam; et tantò
diligentius ea quae legenda misisti debeam examinare, ne quid in iis
praetermittam, quod tueri recusem.

10 Primum itaque, quod ibi minus probo, est quod dicas *Animam ho-*
mini esse triplicem; hoc enim verbum, in mea religione, est haeresis;² et
reverà, sepositâ religione, contra Logicam etiam est, *animam* concipere
tanquam genus, cuius species sint *mens*, *vis vegetativa*, et *vis motrix*
animalium. Per *animam* enim *sensitivam* non aliud debes intelligere,
15 praeter *vim motricem*, nisi illam cum *rationali* confundas. Haec autem
vis motrix à *vi vegetativa* ne specie quidem differt; utraque autem toto
genere à *mente* distat. Sed quia in re non dissentimus, ego rem ita
explicarem.

20 *Anima* in homine unica est, nempe *rationalis*; neque enim actiones
ullae humanae censendae sunt, nisi quae à ratione dependent. *Vis* autem

1 On 17/27 April 1641, Johannes de Raey defended the disputation *Physiologia* Ia. No copy of the original title page of the disputation is extant, so it is not known how Descartes' name was brought up, but in any case Regius disoblged Descartes in this respect (see above, D/R 13, l. 38–41). In the series of the *Physiologia*, De Raey also defended *Physiologia* IIIb (30 June/10 July), *Physiologia* VI (15/25 December) and *Physiologia* IX (June 1643).

2 Regius was well aware of this, as he knew Descartes' letter to Plemp, in which the philosopher reminds his correspondent that it is an article of faith that the rational soul is indivisible and has no other sensitive or vegetative soul attached to it (15 February 1638, AT I 523; cf. R/D 1B, ll. 28–31). Both at the Council of Vienne (1311–1313) and the Fifth Lateran Council (1512–1517) the theory of plurality of souls was condemned (FOWLER 1999, 317). Bitbol-Hespériès, however, points out that in medical tracts the discussion of the human soul as threefold was commonplace (BITBOL-HESPÉRIÈS 1993, 66–67). It was also generally admitted that the theory of the threefold nature of the soul had advantages in establishing the immortality of the soul (FOWLER 1999, 316–317). For the Neo-Scholastic background of Descartes' discussion of the soul in D/R 19, see DES CHENE 2000, especially pp. 155–169 on the tripartite soul.

vegetandi, et corporis movendi, quae in plantis et brutis anima vegetativa et sensitiva appellantur, sunt quidem etiam in homine, sed non debent in eo *animae* appellari, quia non sunt primum eius actionum principium, et toto genere differunt ab *anima rationali*.³ [372]

25 *Vis autem vegetativa* in homine nihil aliud est quam certa partium corporis constitutio, quae etc.⁴ Et paulo post:

Vis autem sensitiva est, etc.⁵ Et postea:

Hae duae itaque nihil aliud sunt quam corporis humani, etc.⁶ Et postea: Cumque *mens, sive anima rationalis*, à corpore sit distincta etc., non immerito *sola* à nobis *anima* appellatur.⁷ 30

Denique, ubi ais: *Volitio vero et intellectio differunt tantum, ut diversi circa diversa obiecta agendi modi*, mallet: *differunt tantum ut actio et passio eiusdem substantiae*. Intellectio enim propriè mentis passio est, et volitio eius actio; sed quia nihil unquam volumus, quin simul 35 | intelligamus, et vix etiam quicquam intelligimus, quin simul aliquid velimus, ideo non facile in iis passionem ab actione distinguimus.⁸ 394

Quod autem tuus Voëtius hic annotavit, nullo modo tibi adversatur.⁹ Cum enim dicunt Theologi nullam substantiam creatam esse immediatum suae operationis principium,¹⁰ hoc ita intelligunt, ut nulla creatura 40 possit absque concursu Dei operari, non autem quod debeat habere facultatem aliquam creatam, à se distinctam, per quam operetur; absurdum enim esset dicere istam facultatem creatam esse posse immediatum alicuius operationis principium, et ipsam substantiam non posse. Alia vero quae annotavit, in iis quae misisti non reperio, ideoque nihil possum 45 de ipsis iudicare.¹¹

3 With a minor change, the whole paragraph occurs verbatim in *Physiologia* Ib, 15 (Appendix, 209, ll. 28–33). The suggestions that follow were adopted as well.

4 Cf. *Physiologia* Ib, 15 (Appendix, 209, ll. 34–35).

5 Cf. *Physiologia* Ib, 15 (Appendix, 210, l. 1).

6 Cf. *Physiologia* Ib, 15 (Appendix, 210, ll. 5–6).

7 Cf. *Physiologia* Ib, 16 (Appendix, 210, ll. 15–17).

8 Descartes' modification and subsequent explanation reoccur verbatim in *Physiologia* Ib, 16 (Appendix, 210, ll. 33–37).

9 Voëtius saw the text of the disputation beforehand. See R/D 18B, and 18C, ll. 13–15.

10 It is probably Regius' explanation of the definition '*Anima humana est actionum humanarum primum in homine principium*' which induced Voëtius to place his remark (*Physiologia* Ib, 15 (Appendix, 209, l. 23)). In the published text, Regius gives a perfectly Scholastic interpretation of the 'first principle', but adds '*alii tamen statuunt ab animâ immediatè operationes fieri, ut à calore fit calefactio*'.

11 As Voëtius had seen all of *Physiologia* (see my commentary), Descartes' remark suggests that Regius had not sent the complete manuscript.

Ubi agis de coloribus, non video cur nigredinem ex illorum numero eximas, cum alii etiam colores sint tantum modi. Sed dicerem tantum: *nigredo etiam inter colores censeri solet, sed tamen nihil aliud est quam certa dispositio, etc.*¹² [373]

50 De iudicio, ubi ais: *Haec nisi accurata et exacta fuerit, necessario in decidendo etc.*, pro *necessario* ponerem *facile*. Et paulo post, pro *itaque haec potest suspendi etc.*, ponerem *atque haec etc.*; neque enim quae subiungis ex praecedentibus deducuntur, ut verbum *itaque* videtur significare.¹³

55 Quod dicis de affectibus, *illorum sedem esse in cerebro*, est valde paradoxum, atque etiam, ut puto, contra tuam opinionem. Etsi enim spiritus moventes musculos veniant à cerebro, sedes tamen affectuum sumenda est pro parte corporis quae maxime ab illis alteratur, quae proculdubio est cor; et idcirco dicerem: *Affectuum, quatenus ad corpus*
60 *pertinent, sedes praecipua est in corde, quoniam illud praecipue ab illis alteratur; sed quatenus etiam mentem afficiunt, est tantum in cerebro, quoniam ab illo solo mens immediatè pati potest.*¹⁴

Paradoxum etiam est dicere, *receptionem esse actionem*, cum reverà tantum sit passio actioni contraria; sed eadem tamen quae posuisti, videntur sic posse retineri: *Re- | ceptio est actio (vel potius passio)*
65 *animalis automatica, quâ motus rerum recipimus; hîc enim, ad omnia quae in homine peraguntur sub uno genere comprehendenda, passiones cum actionibus coniunximus.*¹⁵ 395

Quae denique habes in fine *de temperie ad calidum aut frigidum etc.*

12 Regius accepted Descartes' suggestion, cf. *Physiologia* IIIa, 37 (Appendix, 226, l. 32–33). The disputation was defended by Jacobus Blocquius, or Block, (c. 1619–1645), who matriculated as a student of theology at Leiden University in October 1639 and again in September 1641 (*Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 308, 326). In between he studied in Utrecht, and after his second stay in Leiden he went back again to Utrecht, where he defended a theological thesis under Meinardus Schotanus in May 1642. He became a minister at Scherpenisse in 1644, possibly through the mediation of the professor of theology Dematius, who had been minister at Scherpenisse and Middelburg, the birthplace of Block, before his appointment at Utrecht University (POSTMA 1980, 79. VAN LIEBURG 1996, 25).

13 Descartes' suggestions are adopted in *Physiologia* IIIb, 43 (Appendix, 234, l. 40, 235, l. 3).

14 Descartes' explanation is taken over verbatim by Regius, *Physiologia* IIIb, 44 (Appendix, 235, l. 19–21). Cf. REGIUS 1650A, 4. In *Passions de l'âme* (1649) Descartes rejects the traditional view that the heart is the passions' seat; the principal seat of the passions is the brain, or more specifically, the pineal gland, but the soul nevertheless feels the passions chiefly as they were in the heart (art. 33, 36, AT XI 353–354, 356–357/CSM I 340–341, 342). In adjusting the draft of *Physiologia* IIIb after Descartes' suggestions, Regius incorporated a thesis on passions, which did not meet with Descartes' approval when he reviewed the published text, see D/R 23.

15 Taken over verbatim in *Physiologia* IIIb, 46 (Appendix, 237, ll. 13–15).

70 *deflectente*, non examinavi; quia nullis talibus, tanquam Evangelio,¹⁶
credendum puto.¹⁷

Gaudeo tuum respondentem rectè functum fuisse officio, nec puto
quicquam tibi esse metuendum ab iis qui contra te stilum exercebunt.
Quaecumque mittes libenter legam, et cum solita mea libertate, quicquid [374]
75 sensero, rescribam. Nihil scripsi de Centro gravitatis, sed de vario
pondere gravium, secundum varia à centro terrae intervalla. Quod non
habeo nisi in libro, in quo multa alia simul compacta sunt; sed tamen, si
legere vis, prima occasione qua D. Van S(urck) Ultraiectum ibit, illum
ad te per ipsum transmittam.¹⁸

COMMENTARY

Date

Clerselier printed both a preliminary draft (19A), and what appears to be a final version (19B) of Descartes' reply to R/D 18 (21 April [1 May]). In the first half of D/R 19B Descartes discusses the draft of *Physiologia* Ib, which comments Regius received before the disputation took place, as the comparison with the printed text of the disputation shows. Baillet reports that *Physiologia* Ib was scheduled for 5 [15] May (cf. R/D 18D), and consequently the date of the letter lies between 2 and approximately 10 May 1641.

Text

In CLE and AT the texts of D/R 19 (A and B) and D/R 20 are configured differently than in the present edition. Previous editors consider D/R 19A to be a separate letter, and they take D/R 19B and D/R 20 together, printing D/R 20 without break behind D/R 19B. D/R 19A corresponds to letter AT no. 239, and D/R 19B and D/R 20 correspond to AT no. 240.

72 Gaudeo ... *no new paragraph in CLE*

16 A similar expression is found in Descartes' letter of 11 October 1638, AT II 378.

17 Regius closes *Physiologia* IIIb with a traditional classification of disease according to the principles of the humoral doctrine. Disease is defined as the deviation from the right balance (*temperies*) of one or more of the qualities of the humours, warm (*calidus*), cold (*frigidus*), moist (*humidus*) and dry (*siccus*) (*Physiologia* IIIb, 48–49 (Appendix, 239, ll. 2–39); cf. *Physiologia* Ib, 9–10 (Appendix, 205)). Descartes did not examine the account, stating that one should not put too much faith in the theory of the humours developed by Galen. For Galen's classification of disease, see SIEGEL 1968, 198–215.

18 The book is probably the manuscript of *Le Monde*, and not, as is generally believed, *Examen de la question géostatique* (an appendix to a letter to Mersenne, [13 July 1638], AT II 222–245/CM VII 347–368), see VERBEEK 1994, 543–544. In his *Responsio*, Regius makes a clear reference to *Le Monde*: 'Etiam si omnia naturae arcana nondum specificè ex nostris principiis (uti ingenue fatemur) possimus explicare, eo tamen res jam pervenit (ut iis constat qui Principis nostrae Philosophiae mundum viderunt, aut Physica nostra Fundamenta sunt edocti) ut caelum et terra [...] à nobis jam perfecte intelligantur', REGIUS 1642, 20. The impact of *Le Monde* is noticeable in Regius' second series of disputations in 1641, for example in thesis 22 of REGIUS 1641B-II: '*Motus* (ut primus observavit et docuit Author gallicae dioptricae, horum sacrorum mystagogus) in creatione variis materiae partibus, à Deo variè fuit inditus; isque perseverabit in eodem gradu, donec haec rerum stabit universitas' (cf. *Le Monde*, ch. 8, AT XI 48–56).

In an additional note to the letters AT nos. 239 and 240, Adam and Tannery express their doubts about the unity of AT no. 240 (AT III 703). Descartes' last remark in AT no. 240 suggests that the text consists of two different letters. While Descartes discusses Regius' definition of the threefold human soul in the first part of AT no. 240, he concludes AT no. 240 by saying 'In my previous letter, which I have sent two days ago, I already replied to the question of the threefold human soul' (D/R 20, ll. 19–20). In their note, Adam and Tannery divide AT no. 240 therefore in two parts, taking *Gaudeo* (D/R 19B, l. 72) as the start of a new letter (AT no. 240-B). They suggest the following chronological order: 1. AT no. 240-A, in reaction to a lost missive containing the draft of Regius' first disputation, and therefore written before 17/27 April. Adam and Tannery think it is unlikely that Regius would not have consulted Descartes about the draft of the disputation. 2. AT no. 239, a quick reply to R/D 18, in which Descartes reiterates his objections against the thesis on the tripartite soul; and finally 3. AT no. 240-B, a response to the remainder of R/D 18 sent two days after AT 239.

After Adam and Tannery, several other scholars have tried to solve the difficulties regarding AT nos. 239 and 240. De Vrijer advances the idea that AT no. 239 is a preliminary sketch for paragraphs 2–7 of AT no. 240 (D/R 19B, ll. 10–36).¹⁹ He considers AT no. 240 to be a unity; the letter to Regius referred to in the last paragraph of AT no. 240 would then be lost.

Lacking the actual text Descartes comments upon, Regius' *Physiologia*, Adam and Tannery as well as De Vrijer could not push their hypotheses any further. Micheli, after his rediscovery of a copy of the *Physiologia* in the 1960s, was able to shed more light on some aspects of AT no. 239 and AT no. 240. He rightly deduces that *Physiologia* Ia and Ib were subsequently submitted on 17/27 April and 5 [15] May. Moreover, he notes that much of Descartes' remarks in AT no. 240 can be found in Regius' disputations *Physiologia* Ib, IIIa and IIIb. Micheli concludes that AT no. 240 is a reply to R/D 18, which Regius received before *Physiologia* Ib was printed.²⁰ Unfortunately, Adam and Tannery's additional note on the letters seems to have escaped Micheli, for he does not examine the question of the unity of AT no. 240.²¹

In sum, AT nos. 239 and 240 pose three unsolved questions. 1. The unity of AT no. 240. 2. The relation between AT no. 239 and the first part of AT no. 240. 3. The question of their respective dates.

In order to solve the question of the inner inconsistency of AT no. 240, I accept Adam and Tannery's solution that AT no. 240 is made up of two different letters, which

¹⁹ DE VRIJER 1917, 108, n. 1.

²⁰ M, 352–357. Micheli dates AT no. 239 'fine aprile 1641', but he does not deviate from AT in this respect because he supplies all dates in the Old Style.

²¹ More or less at the same time as Micheli, Roths Schuh discovered a copy of the *Physiologia* in Neuburg a/d Donau. I refrain from discussing Roths Schuh's contribution to the issue at hand, for, in spite of having Regius' text at his disposal, his comparison with Descartes' letters AT no. 239 and AT no. 240 is defective (ROTHSCHUH 1968, 43–44, 48, 61–62). Roths Schuh wrongly concludes that Descartes had not seen the drafts of *Physiologia* Ib, IIa–b, that both parts of *Physiologia* I were submitted on 17/27 April and *Physiologia* II likewise on 5 May. Verbeek, on the one hand recognising that *Physiologia* Ib shows the influence of AT no. 240, but on the other hand maintaining that on 17/27 April both parts of *Physiologia* I were defended, reckons that the date of AT no. 240 is probably wrong (VERBEEK 1992A, 103, n. 22).

I list as D/R 19B and D/R 20. However, I do not regard the paragraph *Gaudeo* as the start of a new letter. To me it seems to be the natural conclusion of the preceding text. Descartes returns to the subject of the first paragraph as he congratulates Regius with the performance of his respondent during the disputation. Next, he kindly offers to read carefully whatever Regius will send him, which is reminiscent of the closure of D/R 13, and probably meant to soften his words of the first paragraph where he said that he is forced to do so.

With respect to the relation between AT no. 239 and the first part of AT no. 240 (D/R 19B), I agree with De Vrijer that the first is a preliminary and unfinished sketch of the latter. I therefore list AT no. 239 as D/R 19A. In both cases Descartes is discussing one and the same passage in the draft of *Physiologia* Ib, namely the definition of the human soul, *Animam homini esse triplicem*. That the final text (19B) turned out to be different from the draft, can be accounted for by supposing that Descartes decided to move from a mere explanation of his objections to offering Regius a ready-made alternative for the passage in question. Nevertheless, the first five paragraphs of 19A still resemble paragraphs 2–7 of 19B to such an extent, that paragraph 8 of 19B probably continues where the 6th paragraph of 19A breaks off (*Denique*, 19A, l. 22; 19B, l. 31). Placing 19A after 19B, Adam and Tannery have been led astray by the opening phrase of 19A, ‘Our entire dispute (*controversia*) concerning the threefold nature of the soul’ (CSMK 181), which may suggest an ongoing discussion between Descartes and Regius.²² However, in the published text of *Physiologia* Ib, paragraphs 3–8 of 19B reappear *verbatim*, and this indicates that Regius readily adopted the alternative proposed in 19B. There was no ongoing controversy.

Finally, the question of the respective dates of D/R 19A, D/R 19B and D/R 20. Micheli established that Regius received D/R 19B and D/R 20 before he submitted *Physiologia* Ib. Adam and Tannery’s conjecture that Descartes had also seen the text of *Physiologia* Ia prior to its defence, is, however, unfounded. The first paragraph of D/R 19B shows that Descartes reacts to *Physiologia* Ia after the disputation has taken place. For he draws a sharp distinction between, first, the things Regius had (already) publicly stated and which Descartes will now have to defend as his own, and second, the things Regius is going to defend in public and which Descartes has to check to be sure that they do not contain anything he would not dare to defend himself. Descartes is forced to this course of action because he finds his name on the title page; had Descartes been consulted about the text beforehand, he would probably have objected to this practice as he had done in the case of Regius’ first disputation in 1640 (D/R 13, ll. 2, 38–41).

²² This is probably the reason why Clerselier had AT no. 240 followed by AT no. 239.

CLE, I, 395–396 (no. 84-II).

AT, III, 374–375 (no. 240-II).

AM, IV, 351–353; RL, 42–44; M, 356–357; CSMK, 183 (partly); B, 118–119.

Non probo quod nolis *squammas piscium etc. vocari corpora lucida, quia non impellunt ipsaemet globulos aethereos*. Id enim etiam non facit carbo ignitus, sed sola materia subtilissima, quae tunc carbonis partes terrestres, tunc globulos illos aethereos impellit.¹

5 Quod etiam *venae Mezeraiicae Chylum in Pancreate² à venis lacteis accipiant*, mihi non constat; nec sanè affirmare debes, nisi certissimâ experientiâ cognoveris, nec etiam eâ de re scribere, tanquam si nullae venae lacteae ad hepar usque chylum deferant, quoniam sunt qui affirmant se id expertos, et admodum verisimile mihi videtur.³

10 Vellem etiam ut ea deleres quae habes contra *Waleum de motu cordis*, quia vir ille est pacificus, et tibi nihil gloriae potest accedere, ex eo quod ipsi contradicas.⁴

Non etiam tibi assentior, cum definis *actiones esse operationes ab homine vi animae et corporis factas*; sum enim unus ex illis qui negant
15 hominem corpore intelligere. Nec moveor argumento quo contrarium [375]

5 Quod ... in CLE, D/R 20 is not divided into paragraphs 10 Vellem ... no new paragraph in CLE 13 Non ... no new paragraph in CLE

1 Next to some examples of luminous bodies (*Physiologia* IIIa, 35 (Appendix, 234, l. 40–235, l. 1)), Regius may have listed in his draft of the disputation some of what he believed to be pseudo-luminous bodies.

2 This is probably not the pancreas properly speaking, but the gland which Aselli called *pancreas* (*pancreas aselli*, cf. SCHOUTEN 1972, 230–231, n. 148) and *Walaeus glandula mesenterii*. See the following note.

3 One usually points to Thomas Bartholin (1616–1680) following a note in the *ExI* (*ExI*, I, 395, in *marginē*: ‘C’est l’opinion de Bartholin. V. la remarque de M^r. de la Forge sur l’art. 3 de l’Homme de M^r. Desc.’), but the reference is in fact to *Walaeus’* first of two letters to Th. Bartholin on blood circulation — published in early 1641 (WALAEUS 1641, 385–408; the dedication dates from 18 December 1640, the letters themselves of 22 September and 1 December 1640 respectively). The letter contains the observation that chyle from the intestines is assembled in a gland (*glandula mesenterii*, the modern term is *cisterna chyli*), from where the chyle reaches the liver via tiny chylous vessels (WALAEUS 1641, 387). Regius, however, was confident enough to maintain in his disputation that other vessels besides chylous vessels transport chyle to the liver (*Physiologia* IIa, 19–20 (Appendix, 213, ll. 14–15); idem in REGIUS 1646, 175). See also D/R 13, ll. 56–65. Trevisani deserves credit for identifying *Walaeus* as the person Descartes alludes to in his letter (TREVISANI 1992, 244, n. 152). The particular passage in *Walaeus’* first letter to Bartholin referred to by Trevisani, however, was added only in the fourth edition of *Walaeus’* letters (WALAEUS 1645).

4 No specific attack on *Walaeus’* views, which Regius possibly inserted in his draft to provoke a polemic, is present in the *Physiologia*. On the difference of opinion on the working of the heart between Descartes/Regius and Harvey/*Walaeus*, see p. 46.

probare contendis; etsi enim mens impediatur à corpore, ab illo tamen ad intellectionem rerum immaterialium iuvari planè non potest, sed tantummodò impediri.⁵

20 De *Anima* | hominis *triplici* iam respondi in praecedentibus quas 396
misi nudius-tertiùs, et idcirco hic tantum addo, me tibi addictissimum
semper futurum.

COMMENTARY

Date

In the last paragraph of D/R 20, Descartes refers to a previous letter sent two days earlier, in which he had already discussed Regius' thesis of the threefold human soul. The previous letter in question is D/R 19B, which I date between 2 and approximately 10 May 1641. The present letter also contains a comment on the draft of *Physiologia* Ib, the influence of which is retraceable in the final version of the disputation (ll. 13–18). Regius thus received D/R 20 before the disputation was defended, on 5 [15] May 1641.

Text

In CLE and AT the text of D/R 20 is printed without a break behind D/R 19B (AT no. 240). For the argument to divide the text, see my commentary on D/R 19.

19 De ... no new paragraph in CLE

5 To some extent Regius appears to have taken Descartes' criticism into account, for nothing similar to the argument referred to is found in *Physiologia*. On the other hand, Regius still defines 'actions' as *operationes ab homine vi animae humanae, vel corporis, vel utriusque factae* (*Physiologia* Ib, 15 (Appendix, 209, ll. 21–22)). 'Actions' are further subdivided into 'natural' and 'animal'. The latter actions, which are either actions of thought (*actiones cogitativae*) or automatic or sensitive (*automaticae seu sensitivae*) actions, depend on the body but need the rational soul (*vis animae seu mentis*) for their accomplishment (*Physiologia* IIa, 17; IIIa, 33 (Appendix, 211, ll. 1–3; 233, 1–3)). Here emerges the difference of opinion on the relationship between mind and body (ROTHSCHUH 1968, 48).

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius

[second half of May 1641]

CLE, I, 397–398 (no. 86).
 AT, III, 454–456 (no. 255).
 AM V, 76–78; RL, 56–59; M, 358–359; CSMK, 199 (partly); B, 128–129.

Vir Clarissime,

Accepi tuas theses, et gratias ago; nihil in ipsis invenio quod non ar-
 rideat.¹ Quae ais de actione et passione, nullam mihi videntur habere
 difficultatem, modò illa nomina rectè intelligantur: nempe, in rebus
 5 corporeis omnis actio et passio in solo motu locali consistunt, et quidem
 actio vocatur, cum motus ille consideratur in movente, passio vero, cum
 consideratur in moto.² Unde sequitur etiam, cum illa nomina ad res im-
 materiales extenduntur, aliquid etiam motui analogum in illis esse con- [455]
 siderandum; et actionem dicendam esse, quae se habet ex parte motoris,
 10 qualis est volitio in mente, passionem vero ex parte moti, ut intellectio
 et visio in eâdem mente.³ Qui vero putant perceptionem dicendam esse
 actionem, videntur sumere nomen actionis pro omni reali potentia, et
 passionem pro sola negatione potentiae; ut enim perceptionem putant
 esse actionem, ita etiam haud dubiè dicerent in corpore duro recep-
 15 tionem motus, vel vim per quam admittit motus aliorum corporum, esse
 actionem; quod rectè dici non potest, quia passio isti actioni correlativa
 esset in movente, et actio in moto. Qui autem dicunt actionem omnem
 ab agente auferri posse, rectè, si per actionem motum solum intelligant,
 non autem, si omnem vim sub nomine actionis velint comprehendere:
 20 ut longitudo, latitudo, profunditas, et vis recipiendi omnes figuras et
 motus, à materia sive quantitate tolli non possunt, nec etiam cogitatio à
 | mente.

398

-
- 1 Descartes had received the printed version of *Physiologia* Ib, on which he comments in ll. 2–22, and the draft of *Physiologia* IIa, which is discussed in the second part of D/R 21. *Physiologia* IIa was defended in late May or early June 1641 by Johannes Hayman, who defended REGIUS 1640A and *Physiologia* IIb as well.
- 2 Thesis 21 of REGIUS 1641B-II (2/12 December 1641) is reminiscent of Descartes' explanation here: 'Hinc constat omnes *actiones et passiones* corporum naturalium tantum esse *motiones locales*, tum *activas*, tum *passivas*'.
- 3 The last paragraph of *Physiologia* Ib is devoted to the difference between will and intellect as *action* and *passion* of the soul (*Physiologia* Ib, 16 (Appendix, 210, ll. 31–37)), to which subject Descartes already contributed in D/R 19B, ll. 31–36.

In Chartulis quas misisti, pag. 2, linea 7, *ac praecipuè cordis*: videtur ibi esse aliquis error calami; non enim premuntur partes à corde,
 25 sed sanguis ad hepar ex aliis partibus missus, ac praecipuè ex corde, iuvat coctionem. Non intelligo etiam quae ibi sequuntur de ligatura geminata, et alternatim dissoluta.⁴

Pagina 4, experimentum de corde follibus inflando, nisi feceris, non author sum ut apponas; vereor enim ne, corde exciso et frigido,
 30 tam rigidum evadat, ut ita inflari non possit; sed facile est experiri, et si succedat, pones ut certum, non autem cum verbis *iudico* et *videntur*.⁵ [456]

Pagina 5, quae habes de magnete, mallet omitti; neque enim ad-
 huc planè sunt certa; ut neque illa quae habes, pag. 6, de gemellis, et
 similitudine sexûs.⁶ Vale et me ama, et communes amicos⁷ meo nomine
 35 plurimùm saluta.

COMMENTARY

Date

Together with D/R 24 and D/R 25, Adam and Tannery place D/R 21 in December 1641, being the latest possible date of the letter. They rightly conjecture that the letters were written in 1641, between April and December, but not having a copy of Regius' *Physiologia* at their disposal, they could not be more specific, nor could they establish the exact chronological order of the letters. Micheli answers both questions. He places D/R 21 in May 1641, pointing out that from Descartes' comments on the *chartulis* (l. 23) sent by Regius, we can conclude that Descartes had received the draft of *Physiologia* IIa. Unfortunately, we do not know exactly when this disputation was defended, but it probably took place in late May or early June. In the first lines of D/R 21 Descartes thanks Regius for sending what appears to be the printed text of a disputation, which, in that case, would be *Physiologia* Ib, for he has already received the published text of *Physiologia* Ia (see D/R 19B). Disputation *Physiologia* Ib was held on 5 [15] May, which means that the present letter dates from the second half of May 1641.

23 In... *no new paragraph in CLE* 28 Pagina... *no new paragraph in CLE* 32 Pagina... *no new paragraph in CLE*

4 Possibly a reference to *Physiologia* IIa, 19 (Appendix, 213, l. 9–11).

5 Descartes' description of the experiment matches the one Regius uses to illustrate his theory of the heartbeat, viz. that the heart expands vigorously during the diastole: 'Porro si quis etiamnum de tempore diastoles cordis dubitet: ille cor canis adhuc calens duobus simul follibus per venam cavam et arteriam venosam alternatim inflatum inspiciat: ea enim ratione clarissime diastole et systole cordis possunt dignosci' (*Physiologia* IIa, 22 (Appendix, 215, ll. 21–24)).

6 No discussion of magnetism or twins is present in *Physiologia*.

7 These mutual friends include Van der Hoolck, Van Haestrecht, Æmilius, and Van Waessenaer Jr. See R/D 53.

CLE, I, 385–386, (no. 81-II).
 AT, III, 65–66 (no. 190-II).
 AM, IV, 60–61; RL, 26; M, 332; B, 93.

Venio nunc ad Theses quas misisti;¹ et quia scio te velle, ut liberè
 scribam meam mentem, tibi hic obtemperabo. Ubi habes: *vicinus aër* [66]
cuius particulae, etc., mallet: *vicinus aër qui*, etc. *potest*; neque
 enim singulae particulae condensantur, sed totus aër, per hoc quod eius
 5 particulae ma- | gis ad invicem accedant.² 386

COMMENTARY

Date

This fragment is all that survives of Descartes' remarks on the draft of disputation *Physiologia* IIb, *De actionibus naturalibus, Pars posterior (Physiologia, 25–32)*. The exact date of the public defence of the disputation is unknown, but it probably took place in June 1641 and before Whitsun holiday, which lasted from 11/21 to 17/27 June. Regius incorporated Descartes' suggestion in the final text of the disputation, and the fragment therefore dates from June 1641.

Text

Clerselier pasted the fragment into a text that consists of fragments of several letters, the main body of which concerns Descartes' discussion of the draft of Regius' 1640 disputation on blood circulation (REGIUS 1640A, see my commentary on D/R 13). The phrase Descartes quotes in the present fragment, *vicinus aër, cuius particulae*, is found in REGIUS 1640A, but without the change Descartes required.³ This makes it unlikely that the fragment belongs to D/R 13, for Regius accepted all Descartes' proposals there.

1 The theses in question concern the draft of *Physiologia* IIb. The text of D/R 22 is the only extant fragment of Descartes' discussion of *Physiologia* IIb, see my commentary. The disputation was defended by Hayman in the first half of June 1641.

2 Regius accepted Descartes' emendation: 'Aër itaque in inspiratione pectus ingreditur, [...] quia thoracis dilatatione *vicinus aër, qui*, teste experientia, nec poros pectoris penetrare, nec nisi magna vi condensari *potest*, de loco deturbatur, ac porro alium loco movet', *Physiologia* IIb, 26 (Appendix, 217, ll. 29–33). Emphasis added. The disputation *Physiologia* II contains an elaborated version of REGIUS 1640A.

3 'Aër itaque in inspiratione pectus ingreditur, [...] quia thoracis dilatatione *vicinus aër, cuius particulae* tam crassae sunt, ut poros pectoris penetrare non possint, de loco deturbatur; qui porro alium loco movet', REGIUS 1640A, [6]/AT III 733–734 (my italics).

[June 1641]

D/R 22

Moreover, a keyword in Descartes' comment, *condensari*, which must have been in the text commented, is absent in REGIUS 1640A. By contrast, Descartes' suggestion is adopted in *Physiologia* IIb, where one finds the wanted keyword as well. In CLE both the part before and the part after the present fragment can definitely be dated June 1640 (D/R 15) and July 1641 (D/R 23) respectively, and the fragment is therefore listed as a separate letter.

23
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[July 1641]

CLE, I, 386, (no. 81-III).
AT, III, 66 (no. 190-III).
AM, IV, 61; RL, 26; M, 333; CSMK, 148 (partly); B, 93.

Neque video cur velis *perceptionem Universalium magis ad imaginationem quam ad intellectum pertinere*.¹ Ego enim illam soli intellectui tribuo, qui ideam ex se ipsâ singularem ad multa refert.² Mallet etiam non dixisses *affectum esse tantum duplicem, laetitiam et tristitiam*, quia
5 planè aliter afficimur ab *ira* quam à *metu*, quamvis in utroque sit *tristitia*, et sic de caeteris.³

COMMENTARY

Date

In D/R 23 Descartes voices his objections to two theses he found in the text of Regius' disputation *Physiologia* IIIb, submitted on 30 June/10 July 1641. Descartes' remarks relate to the published text, because his use of the *plusquamperfectum* in *Mallet etiam non dixisses* (ll. 3–4) excludes the possibility that Regius' text could still be changed. Assuming that Regius sent the publication shortly after the disputation took place, the fragment D/R 23 is dated July 1641.

Text

In CLE and AT, D/R 23 is part of a much larger text (AT no. 190), which consists of fragments of five different letters. Because D/R 23 is written after 10 July 1641, it cannot

1 Neque ... no new paragraph in CLE (in continuation of D/R 22)

1 'Perceptio universalium ad imaginationem pertinet', *Physiologia* IIIb, 42 (Appendix, 234, l. 8). Despite Descartes' remark, Regius maintained the thesis in REGIUS 1646, 285.

2 Cf. *Principia*, I, art. 58 and 59, AT VIII A 27–28/CSM I 212–213.

3 'Affectus itaque est tantum duplex: *Laetitia* et *Tristitia*', *Physiologia* IIIb, 44 (Appendix, 235, l. 25). Regius names the principal passions in five pairs, viz. *amor, odium; laetitia, tristitia; spes, desperatio; audacia, timor; ira* (*pudor* is added only in REGIUS 1646). These passions are then reduced to two, *laetitia* and *tristitia*. Although Regius does not reiterate the reduction in REGIUS 1646, 289–290, *laetitia* and *tristitia* are still treated as exemplary of the other passions. In REGIUS 1650A, 8, Regius advances *voluptas* and *dolor* as the two principal passions (cf. DE VRIJER 1917, 194; HOHN 1990, 28–30). For Descartes' classification of the passions, see *Passions de l'âme*, art. 69, AT XI 380. Regius added the theses Descartes objects to in D/R 23 after he had sent the draft of *Physiologia* IIIb to the French philosopher for his comments, see D/R 19B, ll. 50–62.

[July 1641]

D/R 23

belong to the fragments of AT no. 190 which are certainly of an earlier date, D/R 13, D/R 15 (resp. 24 May and June 1640), and D/R 22 (June 1641). Nor does it seem to be connected to D/R 27 — the fragment immediately following D/R 23 in AT no. 190 — which fragment I date November 1641. Since there is no indication that Descartes commented upon the published text of *Physiologia IIIb* in the other letters he wrote in the summer of 1641 (D/R 24 and D/R 25), I have listed the fragment D/R 23 separately.

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[between June and October 1641]

CLE, I, 398–399 (no. 87).
AT, III, 456–457 (no. 256).
AM V, 79–80; RL, 60–61; M, 359–360; B, 130.

Vir Clarissime,

Legi raptissimè illa omnia quae iusseras ut perlegerem, nempe partem primi, et partem secundi quaternionis, et quinque alios integros.¹

Quae in primò de adstringentibus, incrassantibus et narcoticis, de
5 tuo habes, mihi non placent; peculiarem enim aliquem modum, quo fortè
potest aliquandò contingere ut res fiat, tanquam universalem proponis,
cum tamen plures alij possint excogitari, ex quibus probabile est eosdem
effectus saepius sequi.²

In secundo, ais *Idiopathiam esse morbum per se subsistentem*;
10 mallem dicere *esse ab alio non pendentem*, ne quis philoso- | phus 399
indè concludat, te fingere morbos esse substantias.³ [457]

De febribus autem breviter hic dicam quid sentiam, ne nihil in hac
epistola contineatur; de reliquis enim vix quicquam dicam. Itaque febris
est ...⁴

4 Quae ... in CLE, D/R 24 is not divided into paragraphs

1 Regius had sent Descartes a manuscript of at least seven quires, which included the draft for disputation *Physiologia* IV, *De morbis*, scheduled for September 1641 (cf. ll. 9–11). In print, *De morbis* consists of 20 pages (*Physiologia*, 51–70), so it is likely that Regius sent more material than the draft of *De morbis* alone, which is probably the material for *Physiologia* V (*Physiologia*, 73–94, scheduled for [10/20] November), on which Descartes comments in D/R 25. The respondent of both disputations, Johannes van Horn (1621–1670), defended REGIUS 1641B-1 (24 November OS) as well. Van Horn first studied in Leiden under Walaëus, carried on his studies in Utrecht, and then made a long tour to Italy. In November 1642 he graduated in Padua (DSB, 6, 508–509; NNBW, VII, 624–626; SCHOUTEN 1972, 117; LINDEBOOM 1984, 908–910; POELHEKKE 1961, 329; *Alb. Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 280). On his way home he travelled through France, Switzerland and England. In 1651, he was appointed associate professor at Leiden University, and two years later he became full professor of anatomy and surgery.

2 Descartes' disapproval induced Regius to drop the subject; no exposé on these particular medicaments is present in the *Physiologia*. In *Physiologia* Ib, 6 (Appendix, 202, ll. 35–36), Regius announces that 'vires detergendi, incidendi, adstringendi, laxandi, aperiendi, obstruendi, purgandi etc.' will be dealt with when curation is discussed. A disputation *De curatione* is not known, but 'Vires adstringendi ... incrassandi ... somnum conciliandi' are listed, among many others, as 'facultates medicamentorum' in *Physiologia* IX, *De therapeutica*, 155 (June 1643).

3 '*Idiopathia est morbus ab alio morbo non dependens*', *Physiologia* IV, 56.

4 Clerselier adds: *Deest reliquum. Et si candidè et generosè D. Regius velit agere, illud supplebit*. Clerselier refers to Regius' device to his portrait in REGIUS 1654: *Candide et Generose* (another portrait with the same device is reproduced in DE VRIJER 1917). It is regrettable that the promised account of fever is not

COMMENTARY

Date

Descartes' suggestion in ll. 9–11, on idiopathy, is adopted in *Physiologia IV, De morbis*, a disputation scheduled for September 1641. In ll. 12–14 Descartes sets out to expound his ideas on fever, which is a subject in the same disputation. Unfortunately, the precise date of the disputation is not specified, but it is safe to assume that the letter was written between June and October 1641.⁵

Micheli dates the letter in June 1641, because in his view the second paragraph would deal with the draft of *Physiologia IIIb* (M, 360). According to Micheli, the passage Descartes objects to, and which was subsequently dropped by Regius, would have been a digression on the text of the first page of *Physiologia IIIb*. Micheli probably aims at the last paragraph of the page where Regius names opium as a soporific.⁶ However, since the discussion of the nature and causes of sleep is in itself a digression of the general topic of *Physiologia IIIb*, the internal or common senses, I fail to see how the treatment of drugs would fit in. Admittedly, it is also difficult to see how it could be part of *Physiologia IV*, but the sole reference to opium in *Physiologia IIIb*, defended on 30 June/10 July, is too weak to warrant a date in June 1641.

extant, for Descartes only sporadically discusses the subject elsewhere (cf. AT I 532–533; AT IV 190–191; AT XI 535–537, 602–603). Descartes' concept of fever and that of some Dutch Cartesians, including Regius, is analysed in VERBEEK 1989.

⁵ In AT, D/R 24 is dated December 1641; cf. my commentary on D/R 21.

⁶ *Physiologia IIIb*, 41 (Appendix, 233, l. 26).

CLE, I, 399–400 (no. 88).
 AT, III, 457–459 (no. 257).
 AM V, 81–84; RL, 62–65; M, 360–362; B, 131–133.

Vir Clarissime,

Accepi tuas litteras, in quibus duas proponis difficultates circa ea quae de febribus ad te scripseram.¹ Ad quarum primam: *cur scilicet causam regularium recursuum in febribus fere semper oriri dixerim à materia, quae maturatione quâdam indiget, antequam sanguini misceri possit; irregularium verò, ab eâ quae, cavitatem aliquam implendo, solâ distentione poros aperit*, facile intelliges, si advertas non dari rationem cur istae cavitates tantae sint magnitudinis, et tantus fiat in illis materiae affluxus, ut semper in omnibus hominibus, vel singulis diebus, vel alternis, vel quarto quoque die, vacuentur; dari autem rationem cur aliquis humor unà tantum die, alius duobus, alius tribus indigeat ad maturescendum. [458]

Alteram etiam: *cur nempe, poris apertis, tota aut ferè tota materia expurgetur*, facilè solves, advertendo multò difficilior esse poros planè clausos aperire, quam, postquam semel aperti sunt, impedire ne rursus claudantur; adeo ut satis magna copia materiae debeat effluere, antequam claudantur; imo ferè tota debet effluere, cum nulla est cavitas, nisi quae ex affluxu istius materiae, partes vi distendentis, efficitur; quia partes distentae ad | situm naturalem redire debent, antequam pori claudantur. Si autem sit cavitas per exesionem partium facta, concedo quidem illam materiâ corruptâ plenam manere post expurgationem; adeo ut, cum pori aperti sunt, non nisi pars exsuperans, et latera cavitatis impellens, expurgetur, quae potest esse decima vel vigesima tantum pars materiae in illa cavitate contentae: sed quia sola est haec pars exsuperans, quae febris paroxysmum accendit, ideo sola videtur esse numeranda, et ita semper verum est, totam materiam febris expurgari in singulis paroxysmis. 400

¹² Alteram ... *no new paragraph in CLE*

¹ Cf. D/R 24, II, 12–14. Descartes' remarks on intermittent fever in the next two paragraphs are retraceable in Regius' — disappointingly short — discussion of fever in *Physiologia* IV, 60–61. The phenomenon receives scarcely more attention in REGIUS 1647, 23–26.

Quantum autem ad gangrenam, etsi sanguinis circulatio, in aliquâ parte impedita, possit aliquandò esse remota eius causa, proxima tantum est corruptio sive putrefactio ipsius partis, quae ab aliis causis quam ab
 30 impeditâ circulatione potest oriri, atque, ipsâ iam factâ, circulationem impedire.²

Quae de palpitatione habes, non mihi satisfaciunt, et tam varias iudico esse posse eius causas, ut non ausim etiam aggredi ipsas hîc enumerare.³

[459]

35 Non etiam existimo excrementa difficiliùs egredi per pilos amputatos quam per integros, sed planè econtra facilius, nisi fortè cum radicitùs extirpantur, et pori, per quos egressi fuerant, occluduntur; multique capitis dolores experiuntur, cum longos alunt pilos, iisque postea liberantur, capillis amputatis. Causam autem cur capilli amputati crescant, puto esse quod excrementa copiosius per amputatos egrediantur.
 40 Hocque etiam confirmat experientia: quia maiores recrescunt quam si nunquam fuissent amputati, quia nempe ob maiorem copiam excrementorum per ipsorum radices transeuntium, ii ampliores evadunt.

Denique convulsionem non puto fieri propter tunicarum densitatem,
 45 sed tantum quia valvulae quaedam, in nervorum tubulis existentes, praeter ordinem aperiantur aut claudantur, quod et spirituum crassities, et organi laesio, ut punctura in tendine vel nervo, causare potest.⁴
 Vale.

27 Quantum ... no new paragraph in CLE 35 Non ... no new paragraph in CLE 43 ii (another possible emendation is eo)] eae CLE 44 Denique ... no new paragraph in CLE

2 No discussion of the cause of gangrene is present in the disputations *Physiologia* IV–VI.

3 Despite Descartes' critical remark, Regius included an analysis of the causes of palpitation in *Physiologia* V, *De symptomatis specialibus*, 75. Indeed, it would have been embarrassing not to discuss the principal symptom of pulse, something Descartes understood quite well (cf. D/R 28, ll. 2–9).

4 Descartes' comment is incorporated almost verbatim in *Physiologia* V, 92 (against GARIEPY 1990, 201, n. 24): '*Spasmus est involuntaria et violenta musculorum à spiritibus animalibus dilatatio et intensio. Haec ex eo oritur, quod valvulae quaedam in nervorum tubulis existentes praeter ordinem aperiantur aut claudantur: quod et spirituum crassities, et organi laesio, et [Descartes: ut] punctura in tendine vel nervo, efficere [Descartes: causare] potest*'. In *Physiologia* V, Regius discusses a range of diseases, for the etiology of which he uses Cartesian neuroanatomy (GARIEPY 1990, 201–202, 203). The existence of valves in the nerves — a notion which Regius without a doubt borrowed from Descartes — is introduced in the analysis of the cause of catalepsy (*Physiologia* V, 87). The fact that Regius had an explanation of convulsions of his own but readily exchanged it for Descartes', may suggest that Descartes indicated the presence of these valves to Regius for the first time in the present letter. Gariépy's conclusion that Regius possessed a copy of Descartes' unpublished *L'Homme* (AT XI 135ff), in which the idea is developed, is by no means warranted.

COMMENTARY

Date

Many of Descartes' remarks are adopted in Regius' disputations *Physiologia IV* (September 1641) and *Physiologia V* ([10/20] November 1641). D/R 24 ends abruptly after Descartes' announcement that he will set forth his ideas on fever. It is nevertheless certain that Descartes did send the exposé, because in the present letter he answers two questions raised by Regius regarding Descartes' essay on fever. If the present letter is the immediate sequel to D/R 24, it is likely to have been written shortly thereafter.⁵

⁵ M, 362. In AT, D/R 25 is dated December 1641, cf. my commentary on D/R 21.

26
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[before mid–October 1641]

CLE, I, 389–390 (no. 82).
AT, III, 440–441 (no. 252).
AM V, 64–66; RL, 46–49; M, 362–363; B, 120–121.

Vir Clarissime,

Cum tuae litterae allatae sunt, hic non eram, iamque primùm domum
reversus ipsas accipio. Non magni momenti Silvij obiectiones mihi
videntur, nihilque aliud quam ipsum Mechanicae parum intelligentem
5 esse testantur; sed tamen vellem ut paulo blandiùs ei responderes.¹
Transversâ lineâ in margine notavi ea loca quae duriuscula mihi videntur.

Ad primum punctum, vellem adderes: *etsi paucus sit sanguis in
corpore, venas nihilominus ipso esse plenas, quia se contrahunt ad eius
mensuram.*² Imo hoc ipsum posuisti, sed obiter tantum, et puto esse
10 praecipuum ad eius difficultatem dissolvendam.

Ad secundum, puto sanguinem moribundi ascitici refigurisse in eius
venulis minoribus et à corde remotioribus, ibique coagulatum impediisse
ne novus ex arteriis in venas per circulationem influeret, dum interim [441]
sanguis, adhuc calens in cavâ iuxta cor, in dextrum eius ventriculum
15 incidebat, atque ita cavam fuisse vacuatam.³

Ad tertium, gravitas est quidem plerumque causa concomitans et
adjuvans, sed non est causa primaria; nam contra, situ corporis inverso,
et gravitate repu- | gnante, sanguis tamen in cor non quidem incideret, 390
sed flueret, vel insiliret, ob circulationem et spontaneam vasorum con-
20 tractionem.⁴

7 Ad ... in CLE, D/R 26 is not divided into paragraphs

1 D/R 26 and D/R 28 (cf. l. 10ff.) give evidence of an exchange of letters between Regius and Sylvius on the working of the heart. Before replying to Sylvius, Regius showed both Sylvius' letters and his own draft response to Descartes. Several of Descartes' suggestions in D/R 26 and D/R 28 turn up in Regius' disputation *Physiologia VI, De morborum signis* (15/25 December 1641), in which the two classical diagnostic signs, pulse and urine, are analysed. The relevant section on pulse (diastole and systole), composed in discussion with Sylvius, is included in the Appendix, 243–248.

2 See *Physiologia VI*, 96 (Appendix, 243, l. 34–244, l. 2).

3 See *Physiologia VI*, 96 (Appendix, 244, ll. 8–12). For Regius' discussion of ascites, see *Physiologia V*, 73. For Sylvius' description of ascites, cf. M, 362.

4 In comparison to *Physiologia IIa*, 22, Regius gives in *Physiologia VI*, 96 (Appendix, 243, ll. 21–30) a more elaborate account of the heart's diastole — probably developed in reaction to Sylvius. Added is an explanation why blood enters the heart chambers, for which Regius supplies three causes, viz. the circular blood flow, the spontaneous contraction of the vessels, and gravity (*et plerumque etiam suâ gravitate*).

Ad quartum, ubi loqueris de effervescentiâ sanguinis, mallet agere de eius rarefactione; quaedam enim magis fervent, quae tamen, non adeò rarescunt.⁵

Ad quintum, ubi te accusat, quod affinxis ipsi obiectionem quam non agnoscit pro sua,⁶ responderem me nihil ipsi affinxisse. Nam cum dixisti: *neque his adversatur quod ventriculi in sistole non sint omnino corpore vacui*, idem sensus fuit, ac si dixisses: *sufficere quod maximam partem saltem vacui sint*;⁷ quâ ratione verò maxima ex parte vacuentur, te postea fusè explicuisse, nullamque eius argumenti vim declinasse.

Denique, circa auriculas cordis, malè videris ipsas distinguere ab ostiis venae cavae et arteriae venosae; nihil enim aliud sunt quam ista lata ostia.⁸ Et malè etiam aliquam ipsis tribuis sanguinis coctionem per ebullitionem specificam, etc. Vale.

COMMENTARY

Date

The overall topic in D/R 26 and D/R 28 is Regius' dispute with Franciscus de le Boe Sylvius. Because D/R 26 clearly precedes D/R 28 — D/R 28 talks about Regius' final reply to Sylvius — we have a *terminus ante quem* in D/R 28, which letter cannot predate 4/14 October 1641.⁹ Consequently, D/R 26 is a reply to a letter by Regius written before 14 October 1641 NS.¹⁰

28–29 quâ ratione ... declinasse *italics* CLE, AT

⁵ Descartes asks Regius not to use *effervescentia*, a term favoured by Sylvius (cf. BAUMANN 1949, 67, 87–89), when referring exclusively to the rarefaction of the blood. Cf. *Physiologia* VI, 100 (Appendix, 246, ll. 20ff.).

⁶ This suggests a previous letter by Regius to Sylvius.

⁷ Cf. *Physiologia* VI, 101 (Appendix, 247, ll. 1–2).

⁸ In distinguishing the auricles from the *vena cava* and pulmonary vein, Regius inclines to the modern view. Descartes, however, imposes the traditional Galenic opinion, see *Physiologia* VI, 102 (Appendix, 248, ll. 5–6). Cf. *Description du corps humain*, AT XI 231, 233.

⁹ See the commentary on D/R 28.

¹⁰ In the mistaken assumption that D/R 26 is in reply to R/D 16, Baillet and the *ExI* date D/R 26 in 1640. See my commentary on the text of R/D 16.

27
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[Autumn 1641]

CLE, I, 386, (no. 81-IV).
AT, III, 66 (no. 190-IV).
AM, IV, 61–62; RL, 26; M, 333; B, 94.

Quantùm ad auriculas cordis, addidissem, id quod res est, nos de ipsis curiosiùs non egisse, quia tantùm illas ut extremitates Venae Cavae et Arteriae Venosae, reliquo ipsarum corpore, etc.¹

Omiseram dubium tuum de cordis ebullitione, quod mihi videris
5 iam ipse satis solvisse; cum enim partes cordis spontè subsident, vasis
per quae sanguis egreditur adhuc patentibus, non desistit egredi nec
clauduntur vasa ista, donec cor subsederit.

COMMENTARY

Date, text and context

Both the date and the context of this fragment are conjectural. In CLE and AT, the fragment is part of a larger text (AT no. 190), consisting of five fragmentary letters, which I have successively separated in D/R 13, D/R 15, D/R 22, D/R 23 and finally D/R 27. In contrast with the other two short fragments, D/R 22 and D/R 23, the contents of D/R 27 offer no positive indication of its date or context. It is certain though that it does not pertain to any of the other texts of AT no. 190. Not to D/R 13 or D/R 22, because in those letters Descartes comments upon the draft of a disputation still to come (REGIUS 1640A and *Physiologia* IIa), whereas the *plusquamperfectum* ‘addidissem’ in D/R 27, l. 1 rules this out. Not to D/R 15 or D/R 23, because the physiology of the heart is out of line with the subjects discussed there (respectively Descartes’ *Meditationes* and *Physiologia* IIIb, *De actionibus animalibus*).

The text Descartes comments upon in the first paragraph of D/R 27 must in any case be something meant to be read by a third party, and which, furthermore, could not be changed anymore. But it does not relate to any of Regius’ published works between 1640 and 1646. A possibility that remains, is that the text in question concerns one of Regius’ letters to Sylvius. During his correspondence with Sylvius, Regius showed Descartes Sylvius’ letters and the replies he prepared (cf. D/R 26 and D/R 28). He may

1 Quantùm ... no new paragraph in CLE (in continuation of D/R 23) 4 Omiseram ... no new paragraph in CLE

1 Cf. D/R 26, n. 8.

have supplied Descartes with copies of the final version of his letters to Sylvius as well. In that case, it is possible that D/R 27 concerns Regius' reply to Sylvius discussed by Descartes in D/R 26. In the final paragraph of D/R 26, Descartes objects to Regius' distinction between the auricles and the extremities of the *vena cava* and the *arteria venosa* or lung artery, because Descartes himself upholds the traditional view that the auricles are nothing but these extremities. In *Physiologia VI* Regius adopts this view, but he may have left the matter undecided in the final text of his reply to Sylvius, and simply have said *nos de ipsis [the auricles] curiosius non egisse* (cf. ll. 1–2). On receiving a copy of Regius' letter to Sylvius, Descartes would then have stipulated his opinion once more in D/R 27. If so, it would place the fragment in the autumn of 1641.

The second paragraph is in line with this interpretation. In a previous letter Regius had put to Descartes a particular problem concerning the ebullition of the heart to which Descartes had not responded, because, as he explains, he thought Regius had already solved the question himself in a satisfactory way. In a second letter, Regius repeated his request, and the present fragment is Descartes' answer. The question at hand appears to be Regius' doubt whether or why blood, after the expulsion of the blood during the diastole, still continues to flow from the heart. Related questions are extensively discussed in *Physiologia VI*, in a section devoted to the dispute between Regius and Sylvius.² Regius' letter, then, in which he regretted that Descartes had not answered his question concerning the boiling of the heart, could be the letter Regius sent along with a copy of his reply to Sylvius.

² *Physiologia VI*, 101–102 (Appendix, 247, ll. 1–24).

28
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[November 1641]

CLE, I, 390–392 (no. 83).
AT, III, 443–446 (no. 253).
AM, V, 67–71; RL, 50–54; M, 363–365 (partly); B, 122–125.

Vir Clarissime,

Legi omnia quae ad me misisti, cursim quidem, sed ita tamen ut non
putem quicquam in iis contineri quod impugnem.¹ Sed sanè multa sunt
in Thesibus tuis, quae fateor me ignorare, ac multa etiam, de quibus si
5 fortè quid sciam, longe aliter explicarem quàm ibi explicueris. Quod
tamen non miror; longè enim difficilius est, de omnibus quae ad rem
medicam pertinent suam sententiam exponere, quod docentis officium
est, quam cognitu faciliora | seligere, ac de reliquis prorsus tacere, quod 391
ego in omnibus scientiis facere consuevi.²

10 Valdè probo tuum consilium, de non amplius respondendo Sylvij [444]
quaestionibus, nisi forte ut paucissimis verbis illi significes, tibi quidem
eius litteras esse pergratas, eiusque studium investigandae veritatis, et
gratias agere quod te potissimum elegerit cum quo conferret; sed quia
putas te abundè in tuis praecedentibus ad omnia, quae circa motum
15 cordis pertinebant, respondisse, nuncque videtur tantum disputationem
ducere velle, atque ex una quaestione ad alias transire, quae res esse
posset infinita, rogare ut te excuset si, aliis negotiis occupatus, ipsi non
amplius respondeas.

Initio enim, cum disputat an venae, contractae ad mensuram sangui-
20 nis quem continent, dicendae sint plenae vel non plenae, movet tantum
quaestionem de nomine.³

Ac postea, dum petit sibi ostendi alligatum ferro sanguinem,⁴ et
quaenam sit vera gravitatis natura,⁵ novas quaestiones movet, quales

10 Valdè ... in CLE, D/R 28 is not divided into paragraphs

1 Descartes had received the draft of *Physiologia* VI, and Sylvius' reply to Regius' letter, the draft of which Descartes discussed in D/R 26.

2 Descartes uses words of similar meaning in a letter to Mersenne (22 July 1640, AT III 95–96/CM IX 492–493; quoted in my commentary on D/R 13).

3 See the first point in D/R 26, ll. 7–10.

4 See *Physiologia* VI, 98 (Appendix, 245, ll. 8–11).

5 Cf. D/R 26, ll. 16–20.

imperitissimus quisque plures posset proponere, quàm omnium doctis-
 25 simus in totâ vitâ dissolvere.

Cum ex eo quod sanguis ex venis in cor possit insilire, infert venas
 ergo debere pulsare, facit aequivocationem in verbo *insilire*, tanquam si
 dixeris sanguinem salire in venis.⁶

Cum in comparatione inflationis vesicae notat aliquam dissimili-
 30 tudinem, quod sit violenta, et puer à patente fistulâ os auferat,⁷ nihil agit,
 quia nulla comparatio in omnibus potest convenire; ut neque cum aliâ rati- [445]
 one quam per spontaneam venarum contractionem vult explicare san-
 guinis propulsionem; affert enim fibras transversas vasa coarctantes,
 quod non est diversum à venarum contractione; idem enim significat
 35 fibras vasa coarctare, ac venas contrahere.⁸ Caetera persequer, sed
 omnia per te meliùs potes, et iam ex parte solvisti in Thesibus.

In his autem adiungis corollarium de maris aestu, quod non probo;
 non enim rem satis explicas, ut intelligatur, nec quidem ut aliquo modo
 probabilis fiat; quod iam in multis aliis, quae eodem modo proposuisti,
 40 à plerisque reprehensum est.⁹

Qui motum cordis aiunt esse | Animalem, non plus dicunt quam si 392
 faterentur se nescire causam motus cordis, quia nesciunt quid sit motus
 Animalis. Cum autem partes anguium dissectae moventur, non alia in
 re causa est quam cum cordis mucro etiam dissectus pulsatur, nec alia
 45 quam cum nervi testudinis in particulas dissecti, atque in loco calido
 et humido existentes, vermium instar se contrahunt, quamvis hic motus
 dicatur Artificialis, et prior Animalis; in omnibus enim istis causa est
 dispositio partium solidarum et motus spirituum, sive partium fluidarum,
 solidas permeantium.¹⁰

50 Meditationum mearum impressio ante tres menses Parisiis abso-

6 Cf. D/R 26, ll. 18–20.

7 The example is given in *Physiologia* VI, 97 (Appendix, 244, ll. 14–19).

8 Cf. *Physiologia* VI, 97 (Appendix, 244, l. 24–28).

9 No corollary on the tides was added to Regius' disputations of 1641. Regius explained the phenomenon in his course on physics (quoted in SCHOOCK 1643/*Querelle*, 299–300) and in REGIUS 1646, 90–93. Regius' explanation is essentially the same as Descartes', for which see *Le Monde* (AT XI 80–83) — Regius' source — and *Principia*, IV, art. 49–56 (AT VIII A 232–238).

10 The paragraph reoccurs almost verbatim in *Physiologia* VI, 99 (Appendix, 245, l. 38–246, l. 8). It is, once more, directed against Sylvius. According to Sylvius, the contraction of the heart during systole is an active movement, caused by the contraction of the heart muscle resulting from the cooling animal spirits. The arteries dilate passively as a result of the blood's influx, and subsequently tighten due to the contracting transverse fibres in the wall of the arteries, for which the animal spirits are responsible. BAUMANN 1949, 89.

luta est, necdum tamen ullum exemplar accepi, et idcirco secundam editionem hic fieri consensi.¹¹

Causam, cur in vorticibus iniecta corpora ad centrum ferantur, puto esse, quia aqua ipsa, dum circulariter movetur in vortice, tendit versus exteriora; ideo enim alia corpora, quae nondum habent istum motum
55 circularem tam celerem, in centrum protrudit. [446]

Gratulor D. Vander H(oolck) iterum Consuli, et dictaturâ perpetuâ dignum existimo, tibi gratulor quod in eo fidum et potentem habeas defensorem.¹² Vale.

COMMENTARY

Date

The text of D/R 28 contains three indications to fix the date of the letter: 1. lines 41–49 reoccur almost verbatim in Regius' disputation *Physiologia* VI (15/25 December 1641); 2. in lines 50–52 Descartes mentions that the printing of the *Meditationes* was completed three months ago (28 August 1641¹³); 3. in the last paragraph (ll. 57–58) Regius is asked to congratulate Van der Hoolck on Descartes' behalf because of his election as Burgomaster (4/14 October 1641¹⁴). Consequently, the letter was written some time between late October and early December 1641.

11 On 17 November 1641, Descartes wrote the same to Mersenne: '[il y a] desia 3 mois que le livre est achevé d'imprimer, [mais Soly] ne m'en a pas toutefois encore envoyé aucun exemplaire', AT III 448–449/CM X 780. Descartes announces in the same letter to Mersenne that the Amsterdam printer Lodewijk Elsevier (1604–1670) is going to provide a second edition. The *Meditationes* left the Paris printing office on 28 August 1641 (cf. AT VII 448). The printer Soly shipped a set of copies to Maire in Leiden, but it did not arrive before May 1642 (cf. Mersenne to Sorbière, [1 June 1642], AT IV 60/CM XI 161).

12 Van der Hoolck was elected second Burgomaster on 4/14 October 1641 (VANDE WATER 1729, 192). Frederik Ruysch became first Burgomaster.

13 Cf. AT VIII v. In his letter to Mersenne of 17 November 1641, Descartes mentions the same delay (AT III 448/CM X 780).

14 VANDE WATER 1729, III, 192.

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[second half of December 1641]

CLE, I, 416–417 (no. 90).
AT, III, 460–462 (no. 258).
AM, V, 85–88; RL, 66–69; CSMK, 200–201; B, 133–136.

Vir Clarissime,

Vix quicquam durius, et quod maiorem offensae ac criminationis occasionem daret, in Thesibus tuis ponere potuisses, quam hoc: *quod homo sit ens per accidens*; nec video quâ ratione meliùs possit emendari, quàm si dicas te, in nonâ thesi, considerasse *totum hominem in ordine ad partes ex quibus componitur*, contra verò, in decimâ, considerasse *partes in ordine ad totum*.¹ Et quidem in nonâ, te dixisse *hominem ex corpore et anima fieri per accidens*, ut significares dici posse *quodammodo* accidentarium corpori, quod animae coniungatur, et animae quod corpori, cum et corpus sine animâ, et anima sine corpore esse possint. Vocamus enim accidens, omne id quod adest vel abest sine subiecti corruptione, quamvis fortè, in se spectatum, sit substantia, ut vestis est accidens homini. Sed te non idcirco dixisse *hominem esse ens per accidens*, et satis ostendisse, in decimâ thesi, te intelligere illum esse ens per se. Ibi enim dixisti animam et corpus, ratione ipsius, esse substantias incompletas; et ex hoc quod sint incompletae, sequitur illud quod componunt, esse ens per se. Utque appareat, id quod est ens per se, fieri posse per accidens, nunquid mures generantur sive fiunt per accidens ex sordibus?² Et tamen sunt entia per se. Obiici tantum potest, non esse accidentarium humano corpori, quod animae coniungatur, sed ipsissimam eius naturam; quia, corpore habente omnes dispositiones requisitas ad animam recipiendam, et sine quibus non est propriè humanum corpus, fieri non potest sine miraculo, ut anima illi non uniatur; atque etiam non esse accidentarium animae, quòd iuncta sit corpori, sed

¹ The notorious thesis that the union of mind and body is accidental, or an *ens per accidens*, which sparked the Utrecht crisis, occurs in the third disputation of the series *De illustribus aliquot quaestionibus physiologicis* (REGIUS 1641B-III), defended on 8/18 December 1641. See my commentary.

² The argument is obviously *ad hoc*, but neither Descartes nor Regius dispute the possibility of spontaneous generation, see AT XI 505–506 and REGIUS 1646, 216–219. See also Aucante’s appendix on spontaneous generation in DESCARTES 2000, 217–218.

25 tantum accidentarium esse illi post mortem, quod à corpore sit seiuncta.
 Quae omnia non sunt prorsus neganda, ne Theologi rursus offendantur;
 sed respondendum nihilominus, ista ideo dici posse accidentaria, quod,
 considerantes corpus solum, nihil planè in eo percipiamus, propter quod
 animae uniri desideret; ut nihil in animâ, propter quod corpori debeat
 30 uniri; et ideò paulo antè dixi, esse *quodammodo* accidentarium, non
 autem *absolutè* esse accidentarium.

Alteratio simplex est illa quae non mutat formam subiecti, ut cale-
 factio in ligno; generatio verò, quae mutat formam, ut ignitio, et sanè,
 quamvis unum alio modo non fiat quam aliud, est tamen magna dif-
 35 ferentia in modo concipiendi, ac etiam in rei veritate. Nam formae,
 saltem perfectiores, sunt congeries quaedam plurimarum qualitatum,
 quae vim habent se mutuo simul conservandi; at in ligno est tantum
 moderatus calor, ad quem sponte redit, postquam incaluit; in igne vero
 est vehemens calor, quem semper conservat, quamdiu est ignis.³

40 Non debes irasci Collegae illi, qui consilium dabat de addendo
 corollario ad interpretandam tuam Thesim; amici enim consilium fuisse
 mihi videtur.

Omisisti aliquod verbum in tuis thesibus manu scriptis, thesi deci-
 mâ: *omnes aliae*. Non dicis quae sint illae aliae, nempe *qualitates*.
 45 In caeteris nihil habeo quod dicam; video enim vix quicquam in iis [462]
 contineri, quod non iam ante alibi posueris, et laudo: esset enim labo-
 riosum nova semper velle invenire. Si huc adveneris, semper mihi tuus
 adventus erit pergratus. Vale.

32 Alteratio ... in CLE, D/R 29 is not divided into paragraphs

3 The second part of D/R 29, ll. 32–48, deals with the draft of a disputation. According to NH, on 17/27 December Regius and the professors of theology, in a joint attempt to ease the tension, agreed that Regius would cancel a disputation which had been scheduled before the start of the winter holiday on 24 December/3 January (NH, 31/*Querelle*, 100; also cited in AT III 489–490). The suppressed disputation probably was a fourth disputation in the series *De illustribus aliquot quaestionibus physiologicis*. Descartes remarks that he has little to comment upon, as the draft does not contain much that was new (ll. 45–47). Apart from Copernicanism and the thesis *ens per accidens*, the REGIUS 1641B disputations indeed borrow their material mainly from *Physiologia* I–III.

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter contains Descartes' criticism on the third disputation in the series *De illustribus aliquot quaestionibus physiologicis* (REGIUS 1641B), defended on 8/18 December, in particular on Regius' dictum that man, being a union of mind and body, is an *ens per accidens* (ll. 2–3). Since Voetius' counter-attack during his disputations of 18/28 December, 23 December/2 January and 24 December/3 January is not mentioned, the letter must be dated in the second half of December 1641.⁴

*Context**The disputations De illustribus aliquot quaestionibus physiologicis*

In the last weeks of 1641, Regius lost much of his credit with his colleagues. The professors started to attack each other in their disputations, not only *viva voce*, but also in print. Despite mitigating attempts by the magistracy, the climate deteriorated by the week. The confrontation began when the professor of mathematics, Ravensberger, allowed a medical student to defend a corollary against Harvey.⁵ Regius protested against this intrusion in medical matters to the first Burgomaster and the Senate, but Ravensberger did not give in. Challenged, Regius decided to put the question of the circulation of the blood back on the agenda. The first of a series of disputations on 'famous physiological questions', defended on 24 November OS by Van Horn, is a vigorous defence of his theory on blood circulation (REGIUS 1641B-I). In the last five theses, Regius specifically attacked — without mentioning their names — the hesitations and objections of Ravensberger and the medical student. The last thesis states that those who are still in doubt about blood circulation, walk around with their eyes shut.

Except for the topical matters, the first disputation did not contain anything new compared to the *Physiologia*. The material in the second disputation — an exposition of the Cartesian theory on matter and motion — is largely taken from the *Physiologia* as well.⁶ However, whereas in the *Physiologia* new and controversial ideas are mixed with

4 Adam and Tannery date the letter mid-December, not taking into account that the disputation took place on 8 December OS, i.e. 18 December NS (AT III 459–460). Verbeek has argued that it is not certain that Descartes comments upon the published text and that he may very well be dealing with a draft (*Querelle*, 452–453, n. 101; 484, n. 55; VERBEEK 1992B, 278–279). Descartes' frequent use of the *plusquamperfectum*, however, indicates that he was confronted with a *fait accompli* (cf. *potuisses*, l. 2; *considerasse*, ll. 5 and 6; *dixisse*, ll. 7 and 13; *ostendisse*, l. 14; *dixisti*, l. 15). Moreover, Regius is warned not to give the theologians any *further* offence (*rursus*, l. 26), which implies that the harm had already been done.

5 NH, 20ff/*Querelle*, 91ff. The disputation in question is RAVENSBERGER 1641, submitted on 17/27 November. NH acknowledges that the corollary reflected the respondent's opinion, whereas Ravensberger was in favour of Harvey's theory. The respondent, Bernardus Pandelaert, had already shown himself an adversary of Regius in a satirical poem (cf. BOS 1999B, 422). NH claims that at the last moment some changes were made in the text of the corollary, after complaints by Regius to the magistracy and the rector (Voetius), but there is no proof of that (cf. *Querelle*, 466, n. 40). NH also states that the theses in REGIUS 1641B-I directed against Ravensberger and Pandelaert (see below) were set in a different typeface, which is, again, not the case.

6 The respondent of REGIUS 1641B-II (2/12 December 1641) is a certain Petrus Pueteman, of whom we know nothing.

purely medical matters, Regius now presents the hard core of his natural philosophy on its own, giving it an aggressive turn.⁷

In the second disputation, general form is defined as the general properties of matter.⁸ Special form, or the human rational soul, is dealt with in the third disputation, defended on 8/18 December by Henricus van Loon:⁹ ‘Together with the body, it forms not one being by itself but by accident, because taken separately each is a perfect or complete substance’.¹⁰ The second part of the disputation is equally daring, as it contains a defense of Copernicanism.

According to NH, the actual dispute went on with the usual rowdiness, but when a theological student attacked the paradoxical thesis on man as a being *per accidens*, Regius’ students stamped, whistled and made it impossible for the opponent to speak.¹¹ The tumult grew worse and worse and did not even stop when the *praeses* and the other professors left the auditorium. Voetius lectured Regius for including the dangerous thesis on man as an *ens per accidens*. Regius apologised and said he had read it in Gorlaeus’ *Exercitationes* and had had no idea that it posed a threat to orthodox theology.¹²

Both Ravensberger and Stratenus reacted in their disputations of 11 and 22 December OS.¹³ The professors of theology prepared their own answer, partly out of concern for the attraction the New Philosophy had on some of their students. Indeed, Henricus van Loon, the respondent of the third disputation, was a theological student, who had

7 VERBEEK 1992A, 15.

8 ‘XIV. *Forma rerum materialium est, per quam, cum materia, res naturales id sunt, quod sunt.* XV. *Ea est, vel generalis, vel specialis.* XVI. *Forma generalis, quae vulgo materialis nuncupatur, consistit in comprehensione, motus, quietis, situs, et figurae partium tam sensibilibus quam insensibilibus materiae, rebus naturalibus conveniente*’, REGIUS 1641B-II, §§ 14–16.

9 Henricus van Loon (c. 1617–1659) matriculated in Leiden in November 1637 (*Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 291). His move to Utrecht is not recorded. In June 1642, he defended a theological disputation presided over by Meinardus Schotanus. After his studies he became minister at Zandvoort in 1646 (POSTMA 1980, 79; VAN LIEBURG 1996, 154).

10 Translation from VERBEEK 1992A, 16. ‘VIII. *Forma specialis est mens humana, quia per eam cum forma generali in materiâ corporeâ homo est, id quod est.* *Haec ad formam generalem seu materialem nullo modo potest referri: quoniam ipsa (utpote substantia incorporea) nec est corpus, nec ex motu aut quiete, magnitudine, situ aut figura partium oriri potest.* IX. *Ex hac et corpore non fit unum per se, sed per accidens, cum singula sint substantiae perfectae seu completae.* X. *Cum autem dicuntur incompletae, hoc intelligendum est ratione compositi, quod ex harum unione oritur*’, REGIUS 1641B-III, §§ 8–10. Olivo shows that the two expressions *unum per se* and *ens per se*, respectively used by Regius and Descartes, are equivalent (OLIVO 1993, 76–79).

11 NH, 22–23/*Querelle*, 93–94

12 In R/D 32A (ll. 46–47) Regius wrote to Descartes that the respondent had inserted the thesis in the text without his knowledge, which is very unlikely (cf. *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, AT VII 585). In his posthumous *Exercitationes philosophicae* (Leiden: J. Comelin, 1620) the theological student David van Goirle or Gorlaeus (1591–1612) expounds an atomist philosophy, rejecting most Aristotelian doctrines, including the theory of substantial forms. According to Gorlaeus, the union of body and soul is *per accidens* and man is no less an aggregate being than a heap of sand. In a recently published study, Lüthy assesses that Gorlaeus’ source for his thesis on man is the German physician and philosopher Nicolaus Taurellus (1547–1606). Lüthy argues convincingly that Gorlaeus developed his theory as a philosophical counterpart of Arminian theology (LÜTHY 2001). Voetius’ reaction, who immediately sided Gorlaeus with Taurellus and the Arminian theologian Conrad Vorstius (1569–1622), can be seen as a confirmation of Lüthy’s conclusion.

13 Both disputations appear to be lost, but the relevant corollaries, in Stratenus’ case no less than 18, are found in NH (NH, 22, 24–25/*Querelle*, 93, 95).

the audacity to dedicate his disputation to all three professors of theology.¹⁴ However, the professors' principal motivation was the inadmissible undermining of Aristotelian philosophy, the true *ancilla theologiae*. The theologians decided that Voetius would add three corollaries to a disputation scheduled for 18/28 December. The first corollary states that Taurellus' claim, adopted by Gorlaeus, that man is an accidental being, runs counter to philosophical and theological truth. The second corollary criticised the Copernican world-view, and the last one accused the New Philosophy of paving the way — just like the philosophy of Taurellus, Gorlaeus and Basso — for skepticism and irreligion in its rejection of substantial forms.¹⁵

Alarmed, Regius asked Van der Hoolck to intervene. The burgomaster conferred with the theologians, and the latter agreed to cancel the announcement that the corollaries would be submitted on behalf of the Faculty of Theology. More importantly even, Voetius dropped his accusation, potentially very dangerous to Regius, that the proponents of the idea that man is an accidental being are generally known as atheists. From his side, Regius consented to postpone one of his disputations, scheduled before the winter-recess.¹⁶

After the public discussion of the corollaries on 18/28 December, however, Voetius prepared an elaborated sequel, "Appendix to the corollaries. On the natures and substantial forms of things", which he scheduled to be defended on 23 and 24 December OS.¹⁷ The first part is a strong defence of the theory of substantial forms, which Voetius considers as the cornerstone of Aristotelian philosophy. He carefully examines — and refutes — the arguments against substantial forms brought forward by anti-Aristotelians as Basso, Taurellus, Gorlaeus and Descartes/Regius. The second part focuses on specific points, including the Copernican world view and the substantial nature of the union of body and soul.

¹⁴ Besides Van Loon, two other respondents of Regius, Bruinvisch and Block, were theological students, see R/D 18, n. 6, and D/R 19B, n. 12.

¹⁵ For Sebastian Basso (c.1580–after 1625), see LÜTHY 1997.

¹⁶ See n. 3.

¹⁷ *Appendix ad corollaria theologico philosophica nuperae disputationi de Iubileo Romano, De rerum naturis et formis substantialibus*. NH, 36–51/*Querelle*, 103–115; for the greater part also in AT III 511–519. Reprinted in VOETIUS 1648–1669, I, 870–881. A detailed study of Voetius' *Appendix* is VAN RULER 1995. See also VERBEEK 1992A, 17–18; FOWLER 1999, 324–327.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

[14/] 24 January 1642

Vie, II, 142 [A], 146–147 [B], 147–149 [C] (no. 15).
 AT, III, 367–368 [A] (no. 238–II), 488, 490–491 [B, C] (no. 265).

[A] (In continuation of R/D 18D)

Mais ses thèses, quoique corrigées par M. Descartes, à qui il ne donna pas peu d'exercice pendant tout le reste de l'année 1641, ne servirent qu'à augmenter la jalousie qu'on avait de sa réputation, et à aigrir les esprits des autres Professeurs qui étaient déjà mal disposés pour lui. [*I.m.*: Tom. I des Lettr. de Descart. pag. 396, 397, 398, 399, etc.¹ Lettr. 15 MS. de Reg.]

[B]

Ces corollaires, suivis d'une appendice, avec les thèses théologiques sur le Jubilé Romain, devaient être publiquement soutenus les XVIII^e, XXIII^e, et XXI^e jours de Décembre.² Mais le dessein de Voetius était de les faire signer par avance aux autres Professeurs en théologie, et même à tous les théologiens qui étaient 5 Ministres ou Prédicateurs, et de députer ensuite quelquesuns de ses collègues vers le Magistrat, pour lui donner avis que le médecin, c'est-à-dire M. Regius, aurait été condamné d'hérésie par un Consistoire ou un Concile Ecclésiastique et mis au rang de Taurellus et Gorlaeus; [*i.m.*: Lettr. 15 de Reg. MS.] et que par ce moyen le Magistrat ne pût se dispenser honnêtement de l'ôter de la chaire.³

147

[C]

On réforma donc les corollaires; on ôta de leur titre le nom de la Faculté Théologique, et on corrigea ce qui pouvait regarder personnellement M. Regius, et M. Des-

¹ References to D/R 19A, D/R 21, and D/R 24.

² Voetius countered Regius in three corollaries added to his disputation *Diatribes theologicae De iubilaeo, ad iubilaeum Urbani VIII* submitted on 18/28 December, and in an appendix to these corollaries — a general defence of substantial forms — discussed on 23 and 24 December OS. These texts are briefly discussed in my commentary.

³ NH confirms that the corollaries were to be submitted on behalf of the Theological Faculty (NH, 27/*Querelle*, 97). Because these corollaries attribute both the idea that man is an accidental being and the denial of substantial forms to 'atheists' like Gorlaeus, Taurellus and Basso (see my commentary on D/R 29), they could be seen as a preliminary to a formal accusation of atheism (VERBEEK 1992A, 17). Indeed, had the fellow ministers of the Theological professors subscribed as well, Regius would have found himself in a very difficult position. NH is silent about this — and it may have been just a rumour — but since Descartes mentions it in his *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (AT VII 586), there is little doubt that Regius wrote about it in R/D 30.

cartes. Mais comme les endroits des thèses, où l'un et l'autre étaient nommés ou désignés par leurs écrits ou leurs opinions, étaient déjà imprimés, la précaution du
 5 Consul fut inutile pour ce point; et Voetius se crut fort heureux d'avoir ce prétexte pour couvrir sa désobéissance et sa mauvaise volonté.⁴

Les thèses furent soutenues le XVIII^e de Décembre pour la première dispute, continuées durant les deux jours qui précédaient la fête de Noël.⁵ Le répondant, qui était le sieur Lambert Vanden *Waterlaet*,⁶ [*i.m.*: Gemerthanus.⁷] s'y signala autant
 10 que son président, [*i.m.*: Epist. 15 Reg. MS. ad Cart. et Epist. Cart. ad P. Dinet.⁸] par la chaleur qu'on y fit paraître contre les opinions nouvelles, soutenues avec une ardeur égale par les opposants, qui étaient presque tous écoliers de M. Regius.

Le président trouvant qu'on n'y parlait pas assez de Monsieur Descartes chercha sur la fin de la dispute quelque | question très difficile, pour embarrasser l'un de
 15 ces opposants dans la réponse, sans avoir néanmoins intention de l'écouter favorablement. C'est pourquoi voyant que l'opposant se mettait en devoir de le satisfaire sur la question par des réponses conformes aux principes de la philosophie nouvelle, il l'interrompit brusquement pour dire que ceux qui ne s'accoutumaient pas de la manière ordinaire de philosopher, en attendaient une autre de M. Descartes,
 20 comme les Juifs attendent leur Élie qui doit leur apprendre toute vérité.⁹

[...]

M. Regius [...] prit le parti de répondre par écrit aux thèses de Voetius. Il en écrivit à M. Descartes le 24^e jour de Janvier de l'année sui- | vante pour l'informer
 149 de tout ce que s'était passé, et lui demander avis sur l'avenir. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 15 MS. de

4 Neither Regius nor Descartes are explicitly mentioned in the corollaries, but Descartes is specifically referred to in the sixth paragraph of Voetius' appendix (NH, 47/*Querelle*, 111–112; the text is also found in AT III 517).

5 An account of the corollaries' discussion on 18/28 December is found in NH, 34–35/*Querelle*, 102–103. For the events on 24 December OS, see below.

6 On the theological student Lambertus vanden Waterlaet, the respondent of all three disputations and Voetius' zealous helper in his battle against Regius and Descartes, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

7 Gemert, Vanden Waterlaet's place of origin, is a village in the Catholic province of North-Brabant, c.20 km north-east of Eindhoven.

8 '[Voetius] etiam inter disputandum me nominabat, quaerebatque ab opponente mihi nunquam viso, num ipsi argumenta suggestissem; et indignissimâ comparatione utens, ajebat eos, quibus vulgaris Philosophandi ratio displicet, aliam a me expectare, ut Judaei expectant suum Eliam, qui eos deducat in omnem veritatem', *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, AT VII 587. Cf. below, II. 13–20.

9 According to NH, the disputation was somewhat uneventful, but it does specify Baillet's 'ceux qui ... philosopher' (II. 18–19): the opponent did not reason the academic way, that is, by way of syllogisms (NH, 53/*Querelle*, 116). SCHOOCK 1643 informs us on the 'difficult problem' posed to Regius' students. When the opponent claimed that everything in nature could be explained without the aid of forms or qualities, Vanden Waterlaet challenged him to explain the magnet or the movement of the tides. The opponent failed to answer either question, but when he tried to defend himself by referring to the future publication of Descartes' physics, Voetius sneered 'similes esse tales philosophos Iudaeis seu Rabbinis, qui quotiescumque aqua ipsis haeret aut nodus insolubilis occurrit, dicere solent "Elias veniet". Interim spem pretio apud nos non emi', SCHOOCK 1643, [LXX]/*Querelle*, 177; cf. *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, AT VII 587.

- 25 Reg.] Il lui marqua combien les esprits s'aigrissaient contre lui, et comment le parti
de Voetius se fortifiait de jour en jour; ajoutant que M. le Consul Vander-Hoolck
leur protecteur était d'avis qu'il gardât le silence, ou qu'il calât la voile en traitant
Voetius et les autres Professeurs avec le plus de douceur et de respect qu'il lui
serait possible. Il lui envoya en même temps la réponse qu'il avait préparée contre
30 les thèses de Voetius, afin qu'il l'examinât avec le même droit qu'il avait sur ses
autres écrits.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 24 January 1642, without indication of the calendar used. However, since the letter is indubitably written before R/D 32, which letter we can date [23 January/] 2 February 1642 (see the commentary on R/D 32), the precise date of the present letter is 24 January NS.

Context

The letter is the first of seven letters exchanged between Descartes and Regius within a fortnight. The issue at hand is the composition of a response to Voetius' *Appendix* to his disputations of 23 and 24 December 1641 OS. The liveliness of the correspondence stems from both men's urge to publish the response as soon as possible, if possible before the end of the academic holiday (1/11 February).¹⁰ The *Responsio* finally appeared on 16/26 February.¹¹

¹⁰ See D/R 31, ll. 273–274.

¹¹ NH, 53/*Querelle*, 116.

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius

[late January 1642]

CLE, I, 401–410, 414–415 (no. 89-I).

AT, III, 491–502, 509 (no. 266-I).

AM, V, 111–125, 135–136; RL, 72–86, 98; CSMK, 205–207 (partly); B, 150–164, 180–181.

Vir Clarissime,

Habui hîc toto pomeridiano tempore praestantis(si)mum virum D. Al-
 <phonsum>¹ qui multa mecum de rebus Ultraiectinis amicissimè ac pru-
 dentissimè disseruit. Planè cum ipso sentio, tibi ad aliquod tempus à
 5 publicis disputationibus esse abstinendum, et summoperè cavendum,
 ne ullos in te verbis asperioribus irrites.² Vellem etiam quammaximè,
 ut nullas unquam novas opiniones proponeres, sed antiquis omnibus
 nomine tenus retentis, novas tantum rationes afferres: quod nemo pos-
 set reprehendere; et qui tuas rationes rectè caperent, sponte ex iis ea [492]
 10 quae velles intelligi, concluderent. Ut, de ipsis Formis Substantialibus
 et Qualitatibus Realibus, quid opus tibi fuit eas palam reiicere? Nunquid
 meministi me, in Meteoris pag. 164,³ expressissimis verbis monuisse
 ipsas nullomodo à me reiici aut negari, sed tantummodo non requiri
 ad rationes meas explicandas? Quod idem si fuisses secutus, nemo
 15 tamen ex tuis auditoribus non illas reiecisset, cum nullum earum usum
 esse perspexisset, nec interim in tantam collegarum tuorum invidiam
 incidisses. Sed quod factum est, infectum fieri nequit. Nunc curandum
 est, ut quaecumque vera proposuisti, quam modestissimè defendas, et
 si quae minus vera, vel tantum minus aptè dicta, elapsa sint, absque ullâ

1 The *ExI* supplies *Alphonsum*, whom Baillet claims to be a military man and a close friend of Descartes', spending his leaves in Utrecht (*Vie*, II, 47 (cf. R/D 10), 149). There is little doubt that the same person is meant in a letter by Reneri, in which he announces his intention to send something to Huygens via 'Monsr. Alfonso' (to De Wilhem, 28 February 1638, in DIBON 1990, 217–218). The person in question is probably Alphonse Pollot, a captain in the Dutch army, a friend and correspondent of Descartes' (see the *Biographical Lexicon*). Part of the early correspondence went via Reneri (cf. my commentary on R/D 1, *Context 1*). His ties with Utrecht are confirmed by Descartes (AT II 545), who, moreover, also informs us that in January 1642 Pollot assisted Regius in Utrecht: 'Mr de Pollot vous en peut dire des nouvelles, de ce qu'il a vû a Utrecht ou il a aydé a combattre pour moy', Descartes to Huygens, 31 January 1642, AT III 523–524.

2 This is, in fact, what Regius and the professors of theology had agreed upon on 17/27 December 1641 (NH, 31/*Querelle*, 100; also cited in AT III 489–490). Cf. D/R 29, n. 3.

3 AT VI 239. CLE specifies *editionis gallicae*, which addition is obviously Clerselier's because no translation of the *Essais* was available in January 1642. For similar cases in CLE, see my commentary on D/R 45.

20 pertinaciâ emendes, putesque nihil esse in philosopho magis laudandum
quam liberam errorum suorum confessionem. Ut in hoc, *quod homo sit*
ens per accidens, | scio te nihil aliud intellexisse quam quod alij omnes 402
admittunt, nempe illum esse compositum ex duabus rebus realiter dis-
tinctis; sed quia verbum, *ens per accidens*, eo sensu non usurpatur in
25 sc(h)olis, idcirco longè melius est (si fortè uti non possis explicatione,
quam praecedentibus meis litteris suggesseram:⁴ video enim te ab illâ
nonnihil deflectere, necdum scopulos satis vitare in tuo ultimo scripto⁵),
ut apertè fatearis te illum sc(h)olae terminum non rectè intellexisse,
quam ut malè dissimules; ideoque, cum de re planè idem quod alij senti-
30 tires, in verbis tantum discrepasse. Atque omnino ubicumque occurret [493]
occurrit occasio, tam privatim quam publicè, debes profiteri te credere hominem
esse *verum ens per se, non autem per accidens*, et mentem corpori realiter
et substantialiter esse unitam, non per situm aut dispositionem, ut
habet in tuo ultimo scripto (hoc enim rursus reprehensioni obnoxium
35 est, et meo iudicio non verum), sed per verum modum unionis, qualem
vulgò omnes admittunt, etsi nulli, qualis sit, explicent, nec ideo etiam
teneris explicare; sed tamen potes, ut ego in *Metaphysicis*⁶, per hoc,
quod percipiamus sensus doloris, aliosque omnes, non esse puras cogitationes
40 mentis à corpore distinctae, sed confusas illius realiter unitae
perceptiones: si enim Angelus corpori humano inesset, non sentiret ut
nos, sed tantum perciperet motus qui causarentur ab objectis externis,
et per hoc à vero homine distingueretur.

Quantùm ad tuum scriptum, etsi non videam quid eo facere velis,
mihi videtur, ut ingenuè et candidè fatear quod sentio, nec ad rem
45 propositam, nec ad fortunam huius temporis satis esse accommodatum;
multa enim in eo nimis dura, et non satis apertè rationes explicas,
quibus bona causa defenditur, adeò ut in eo scribendo, ex taedio forsitan
atque indignatione, ingenium tuum languisse videatur. Excusabis, ut
confido, libertatem meam; et quia mihi esset difficilior, de singulis quae
50 scripsisti monere quid sentiam, quam aliquod tale scriptum delineare,
hoc potius | agam, et quamvis multò me alia negotia urgeant, unam 403
tamen aut alteram huic rei diem impendam. Existimo itaque operae [494]
pretium esse, ut ad *Appendicem* Voëtij publico scripto respondeas; quia

⁴ D/R 29, ll. 4–31.

⁵ Regius' draft of his response to Voetius' *Appendix*.

⁶ *Meditationes de prima philosophia*, AT VII 74–76.

si planè taceres, tibi forte tanquam victo magis insultarent inimici;
 55 sed tam blandè ac modestè respondeas, ut neminem irrites, simulque
 tam solidè, ut rationibus tuis se vinci Voëtius animadvertat, et ideo,
 ne saepius vincatur, tibi contradicendi animum deponat, seque à te
 demulceri patiatur. Cursim hic ponam argumentum illius responsionis,
 qualem ego ipsam faciendam putarem, si tuo in loco essem; et partim
 60 gallicè, partim latinè scribam, prout verba celerius occurrent, ne forte,
 si latine tantum scriberem, verba mea mutare negligeres, et stilus nimis
 incultus pro tuo non agnosceretur.⁷

*Henrici Regij, etc. Responsio ad Appendicem; vel Notae in
 Appendicem ac Corollaria Theologico–Philosophica
 65 Domini Gisb. Voëtij, etc.*

Je voudrois apres commencer par une honneste lettre à Monsieur
 Voëtius, en laquelle ie dirois qu’ayant vû les tres-doctes, tres-excellentes,
 et tres-subtiles Theses qu’il a publiées touchant les Formes Substantielles,
 et autres matieres appartenantes à la Physique, et qu’il a particulièrement
 70 adressées aux Professeurs en Medecine et en Philosophie de cette Université,
 au nombre desquels ie suis compris, i’ay esté extrêmement ayse de ce qu’un
 si grand homme a voulu traiter de ces matieres, comme ne doutant point
 qu’il n’auroit usé de toutes les meilleures raisons qui se peuvent trouver,
 pour prouver les opinions qu’il défend; [495]
 75 en sorte qu’apres les siennes, il n’en faudroit plus attendre d’autres. Et
 mesme que ie me suis réjoüy de ce que la plus-part des opinions qu’il
 a voulu deffendre en ces Theses, estant directement contraires à celles
 que i’ay enseignées, il semble que ç’a esté particulièrement à moy à
 qui il a adressé sa Préface, et qu’il a voulu par là me convier | à luy 404
 80 répondre, et ainsi m’inviter, par une honneste émulation, à rechercher
 d’autant plus curieusement la verité. Que ie m’estime bien glorieux de
 ce qu’il m’a voulu faire cét honneur. Que ie ne puis manquer de tirer de
 l’avantage de cette attaque, à cause que ce me sera mesme de la gloire,

⁷ In the remaining part of D/R 31, as well as in D/R 33, ll. 23ff., Descartes frequently refers to or cites from the text Voëtius discussed on 23 and 24 December 1641 OS: *Appendix ad corollaria theologico-philosophica nuperae disputationi de Iubileo Romano, De rerum naturis et formis substantialibus* (NH, 36–51; VOETIUS 1648–1669, I, 870–881). Since the text is available in several modern editions, I have refrained from incorporating it in the footnotes or commentary (*Querelle*, 103–115; AT III 511–519). For a detailed study of Voëtius’ *Appendix* and the response by Descartes and Regius, see VAN RULER 1995.

si ie suis vaincu par un si fort adversaire. Que ie luy en rens graces tres-
 85 affectueusement, et mets cela au nombre des obligations que ie luy ay, et
 que ie reconnois estre tresgrandes. *Hic fusè commemorarem quomodo*
me iuverit in professione acquirendâ, quomodo mihi patronus, mihi fau-
*tor, mihi adiutor semper fuerit, etc.*⁸ Enfin que ie n'aurois pas manqué
 de répondre à ses Theses par d'autres Theses, et de faire comme luy
 90 des disputes publiques touchant ces matieres, si ie pouvois esperer une
 audience aussi favorable et aussi tranquille; mais qu'il a en cela beau-
 coup d'avantage par dessus moy, à cause que le respect et la veneration
 qu'on a pour luy, non seulement à cause de ses qualitez de Recteur,
 et de Ministre, mais beaucoup plus à cause de sa grande pieté, de son
 95 incomparable doctrine, et de toutes ses autres excellentes qualitez, est
 capable de retenir les plus insolens, et d'empescher qu'ils ne fassent
 aucun desordre aux lieux où il préside; au lieu que, n'ayant point le
 mesme respect pour moy, deux ou trois fripons, que quelque ennemy
 aura envoyez à mes disputes, seront suffisans pour les troubler; et ayant
 100 éprouvé cette fortune en mes dernières,⁹ ie croirois m'abaisser trop, et
 ne pas assez conserver la dignité du lieu, que notre tres-sage Magistrat
 m'a fait l'honneur de vouloir que i'occupasse en cette Academie, si ie
 m'y exposois d'orénavant. Non pas que ie sois fâché pour cela, ny que
 ie pense devoir aucunement estre honteux de ce qui s'est passé; car, au
 105 contraire, ces faiseurs de bruit ayant tou-jours interrompu nos reponses,
 avant que de les avoir pû entendre, il a esté tres-aisé à remarquer, que
 nous n'avons point donné occasion à leur insolence par nos fautes, mais
 qu'ils étoient venus à nos disputes tout à dessein de les troubler, et d'em-
 pescher que nous ne pussions avoir le temps de faire bien entendre nos
 110 raisons. Et l'on ne peut iuger de là autre chose, sinon que mes ennemis,
 en se servant d'un moyen si seditieux et si injuste, ont témoigné qu'ils
 ne cherchent pas la verité, et qu'ils n'esperent pas que leurs raisons
 soient si fortes que les miennes, puis qu'ils ne veulent pas qu'on les
 entende. Et quand on ne sçauroit pas que ces troubles m'auroient esté
 115 procurez par l'artifice d'aucuns ennemis, *sed à solâ iuvenum aliquorum*
lasciviâ, on sçait bien que les meilleures choses estant exposées au pu-
 blic, sont aussi souvent sujettes à cette fortune, que les plus mauvaises

8 '[Voetius], quemque ego, ut amicum, fautorem, et patronum meum summum, quam obsequiosissime semper colo', *Responsio*, 4.

9 Regius' disputation of 8/18 December 1641; cf. my commentary on D/R 29.

ou impertinentes. Ainsi on estoit autrefois fort attentif aux badineries
 d'un danceur de corde, là où ceux qui representoient une très belle et
 120 tres-elegante Comedie de Terence, estoient chassez du theatre par de [497]
 tels battements de mains;¹⁰ ainsi, etc. Ces raisons donc me donnent
 sujet de publier plutost cette réponse que de faire des Theses; ioint aussi
 qu'on peut mieux trouver la verité, en examinant à loisir, et de sens
 froid, deux écrits opposez sur un mesme sujet, que non pas en la chaleur
 125 de la dispute, où l'on n'a pas assez de temps pour peser les raisons de
 part et d'autre, et où la honte de paroistre vaincus, si les nostres estoient
 les plus foibles, nous en oste souvent la volonté. C'est pourquoy ie le
 supplie de la recevoir en bonne part, comme ne l'ayant faite que pour
 luy plaire, et luy témoigner que ie ne suis pas si négligent, que de man-
 130 quer de satisfaire à l'honneste semonce qu'il m'a faite par ses Theses,
 de faire voir au public les raisons que i'ay, pour soutenir les opinions
 qu'il a impugnées; et ce, pour le bien general *totius rei litterariae*, et
 particulierement pour le bien et la gloire de cette Université, et que ie
 l'honoraray et estimeray tou-jours *ut patronum, fautorem amicissimum*,
 135 etc. Vale.

Après une lettre de cet argument, ie ferois imprimer, *Domini Gis-
 berti Voëtij praefatiuncula, ad Doctiss. expertiss. Medic.*, etc., usque ad
 Thesim primam.¹¹ |

406

RESPONSIO AD PRAEFATIONEM

140 Que ie loüe icy grandement sa civilité et sa courtoisie,¹² de ce que,
 nonobstant le pouvoir que sa Theologie, qui est la principale science, [498]
 luy donne sur toutes les autres, et celuy que sa qualité de Recteur
 luy donne particulierement en cette Academie, il n'a pas voulu traiter
 des matieres de Physique, sans user de quelque excuse envers les Pro-
 145 fesseurs en Philosophie et en Medecine. Que ie suis fort d'accord avec
 luy de ce qu'il blâme les *adolescentes, qui vix elementis Philosophiae*

10 Reference to *Hecyra*, a play by the Roman dramatist and comedy-writer Terence (2nd century BC), the first two performances of which failed because the audience preferred to watch tightrope walkers (Prolog. I, 4–5; Prolog. II, 33–35).

11 Regius adopted the suggestion. The *Responsio* gives Voetius' preface and the theses, each time followed by Regius' reply.

12 'Non possum autem hęc non laudare maximam tuam humanitatem ...', *Responsio*, 6. Regius used the whole paragraph, in his own translation, in the *Responsio*.

imbuti, absque evidenti et validâ demonstrationum evictione, omnem
sc(h)olarum Philosophiam exhibilant, antequam terminos eius intellex-
erint, eorumque notione destituti, authores superiorum facultatum sine
 150 *fructu legant, lectionesque et disputationes, tanquam mutae personae*
aut statuae Dedaleae¹³, audire cogantur.¹⁴ Sed quia valdè diligenter ip-
sos hoc in exordio admonet, ne tam facilè id agant, et comme si c'estoit
une faute fort ordinaire, laquelle toutesfois a esté inconnuë jusques à
present, non immeritò suspicor hoc de solis auditoribus meis intelligi;
 155 *car i'ay déjà sceu que quelques-uns, estant jaloux de voir les grans pro-*
grez que mes auditeurs faisoient en peu de tems, ont tâché de décrier ma
façon d'enseigner, en disant que ie negligeois de leur expliquer les ter-
mes de la Philosophie, et ainsi que ie les laissois incapables d'entendre
les livres, ou les autres Professeurs, et que ie ne leur apprenois que
 160 *certaines subtilitez, dont la connoissance leur donnoit apres cela tant*
de presumption, qu'ils osoient se mocquer des opinions communes. Et
*pour ce sujet ie me persuade que Monsieur Voëtius (ou *Rector magnifi-**
cus, etc. Donnez luy les titres les plus obligeans et les plus avantageux
que vous pourrez) ayant esté averty de cette calomnie, en a voulu toucher [499]
 165 *icy un mot en passant, afin de me donner occasion de m'en pur- | ger; ce* 407
que ie feray facilement, en faisant voir que ie ne manque pas d'expliquer
tous les termes de ma profession, lors que les occasions s'en presentent,
bien que i'aye encore plus de soin d'enseigner les choses. Et ie veux
bien confesser que, d'autant que ie ne me sers que de raisons qui sont
 170 *tres-evidentes, et intelligibles à ceux qui ont seulement le sens com-*
mun, ie n'ay pas besoin de beaucoup de termes étrangers pour les faire
entendre; et ainsi, qu'on peut bien plutost avoir appris les veritez que
i'enseigne, et trouver son esprit satisfait touchant toutes les principales
difficultez de la Philosophie, qu'on ne peut avoir appris tous les termes
 175 *dont les autres se servent pour expliquer leurs opinions touchant les*
mesmes difficultez, et avec tous lesquels ils ne satisfont iamais ainsi
les esprits qui se servent de leur raisonnement naturel, mais les rem-
plissent seulement de doutes et de nuages. Et enfin que ie ne laisse
pas d'enseigner aussi les termes qui me sont inutiles, et que, les faisant

179 faisant AT] fesant CLE

13 The legendary craftsman and inventor Daedalus, whose statues were able to walk and to speak.

14 Quotation from Voetius' *Praefatiuncula*, NH, 38/*Querelle*, 104, also in AT III 512.

180 entendre en leur vray sens, *celerius à me quam vulgò ab aliis discuntur*.
 Ce que ie puis prouver par l'experience que plusieurs de mes auditeurs
 ont faite, et dont ils ont rendu preuve en disputant publiquement, apres
 n'avoir étudié que tant de mois, etc.¹⁵ Or ie m'assure qu'il n'y a per-
 sonne de bon sens, qui ose dire qu'il y ait rien à blâmer en tout cecy,
 185 ny mesme qui ne soit grandement à priser. *Etsi enim saepe hinc contin-*
gat, ut qui mea audiverunt, ea quae ab aliis in contrarium docentur, ut
minùs rationi consentanea, contemnant, vel etiam, si placet, exsibilent,
 on n'en doit pas rejeter la faute sur ma façon d'enseigner, mais plu-tost
 sur celle des autres, et les convier à suivre la mienne autant qu'il leur [500]
 190 sera possible, plu-tost que de la calomnier, *et velle ipsam calumniâ suâ*
obruere.

THESIS PRIMA, etc.
Responsio ad primam Thesim.

Planè hic assentior sententiae Domini Rectoris Magnifici, nempe
 195 quod *innoxia illa entia*, quae formas substan- | tiales et qualitates reales 408
 vocant, *non sint temerè de antiquâ suâ possessione deturbanda*; quin et
 ipsa nondum hactenus absolutè reiecimus, sed tantummodò profitemur
 nos ipsis non indigere ad causas rerum naturalium reddendas, puta-
 musque rationes nostras eo praecipue nomine esse commendandas, quod
 200 ab eiusmodi assumptis incertis et obscuris nullomodo dependeant.¹⁶
 Quoniam in talibus idem ferè est dicere, se iis nolle uti, ac dicere, se non
 admittere: quia nempe ab aliis non aliam ob causam admittuntur, quam
 quia necessariae esse putantur ad effectuum naturalium causas explican-
 das, non difficiles erimus in confitendo nos illa planè reiicere. Neque
 205 id, ut spero, Mag. Rector vitio nobis vertet, quia dudum *sc(h)olarum*
Philosophiam, nominatim *Logicam, Metaphysicam, Physicam, si non*
accuratissimè, saltem mediocriter perdidicimus, et misera illa entia nul-
 lius usus esse percepimus, nisi ad excaecanda studiosorum ingenia, et

185 Etsi CLE (1663), *Responsio*] Et si CLE (1657) 194 Magnifici AM] Magistri CLE 195–196 *innoxia*
 ... *deturbanda emphasis added, cf. Responsio, 8 (indicating a literal quotation)* 195 *quae* CLE (1657)]
 qua CLE (1663) 205–207 *scholarum* ... *perdidicimus emphasis added, cf. Responsio, 9 (indicating a literal*
quotation)

15 Cf. the notice on Regius' student Hayman in my commentary on D/R 13.

16 'Vid. meteora Renati des Cartes 164' (AT VI 238–239), marginal note in *Responsio* (cf. l. 12 above).

210 ipsis, in locum doctae illius ignorantiae, quam Rect. Mag. tantoperè
 commendat, superbam quandam aliam ignorantiam obtrudendum. Sed
 ne parùm liberales videamur, laudo etiam quod Mag. Rect. *adoles-* [501]
centes à feroce contemptu et fugâ studij Philosophici, atque insuper ab
idioticâ, rusticâ et superbâ ignorantia velit revocare, nec ullomodò pos-
 sum suspicari eum hîc respexisse ad illam in meos auditores querelam,
 215 de quâ paulo antè, quod scilicet vulgarem Philosophiam, meâ intel-
 lectâ, contemnant. Neque enim fas puto, existimare tam pium virum,
 ab omni maledicendi studio tam alienum, et mihi privatim summè am-
 icum, tam alienis nominibus uti voluisse, ut cognitionem Philosophiae
 quam doceo, quaeque tam vera et aperta est, ut qui semel ipsam didicit,
 220 alias facilè contemnat, *rusticam, idioticam, et superbam ignorantiam*
 appellet, contemptumque istum opinionum quae falsae existimantur, or-
 tum ex cognitione Philosophiae verioris, vocet *ferocem, et fugam studij*
Philosophici; tanquam si, per studium Philosophicum, nil nisi studium
 earum controversiarum, in quibus nulla unquam | certa veritas habetur, 409
 225 non autem studium ipsius veritatis, sit intelligendum.¹⁷

THESIS SECUNDA, etc.

Responsio ad Thesim secundam, etc.

Duodecim hîc puncta proponuntur, quae optimè paulò antè ab ipso
 Mag. Rectore *praeiudicia et dubia* fuerunt appellata; quia nihil affir-
 230 mandi, sed dubitandi tantum, occasionem dare possunt iis qui magis
 praeiudiciis quàm rationibus moventur, et perfacilè solvuntur ab iis qui
 rationum momenta examinant.

In primo, quaerit an conciliari possit opinio negans formas sub- [502]
stantiales cum sacrâ scripturâ. Qua de re nemo potest dubitare, qui
 235 tantùm sciet Prophetas et Apostolos, aliósque qui dictante Spiritu Sancto
 sacras scripturas composuerunt, de Entibus istis Philosophicis, et extra

211–213 *adolescentes ... revocare emphasis added, cf. Responsio, 9 (indicating a literal quotation)* 212 *Phi-*
losophici CLE (1657)] Philosophi CLE (1663) 218 *alienis CLE (1657)] alienis CLE (1663)* 220 *rusticam*
... ignorantiam emphasis added, cf. Responsio, 9 (indicating a literal quotation) 222–223 *ferocem ...*
Philosophici emphasis added, cf. Responsio, 9 (indicating a literal quotation)

17 With some minor changes Regius adopts Descartes' answer in his *Responsio*, but he adds nearly two
 pages, in which he propounds the Cartesian theory of matter, effectively rejecting the Aristotelian notions
 of prime matter and substantial forms.

sc(h)olas planè ignotis, nunquam cogitasse. Ne enim aliqua sit ambiguitas in verbo, hic est notandum, nomine formae substantialis, cum illam negamus, intelligi substantiam quandam materiae adiunctam, et
 240 cum ipsâ totum aliquod merè corporeum componentem, quaeque non minùs, aut etiam magis quam materia, sit vera substantia, sive res per se subsistens, quia nempe dicitur esse Actus, illa vero tantùm Potentia. Huius autem substantiae, seu formae substantialis, in rebus merè corporalibus, à materiâ diversae, nullibi planè in sacra scriptura mentionem
 245 fieri putamus. Atque inter caetera, ut agnoscatur quam parum urgeant ea loca scripturae, quae à Mag. Rect. hîc citantur, puto sufficere si omnia referamus. Nempe, Gen. 1, vers. 11, habetur: *Et ait: Germinet terra herbam virentem et facientem semen, et lignum pomiferum faciens fructum iuxta genus suum.* Et 21: *Creavit Deus cete grandia, et omnem*
 250 *animam viventem atque motabilem, quam produxerunt aquae in species suas, et omne volatile secundum genus suum, etc.* *Je vous prie de mettre tous les autres passages, car ie les ay tous cherchez, et ie ne voy rien qui serve aucunement à son sujet.*¹⁸ Neque enim potest dici verba generis aut speciei designare | differentias substantiales, cum sint etiam
 255 genera et species accidentium ac modorum, ut figura est genus, respectu circulorum et quadratorum, quae tamen nemo suspicatur habere formas substantiales, etc.

Caeterùm in his fui prolixior quam putaram, et quia non certus
 260 sum te hoc meo scripto esse usurum, nolo iam plura scribere; sed si uti velis, rogo ut moneas quamprimùm, et reliqua protinus usque ad finem absolvam; scribasque quâ me linguâ uti malis. Ubi posui *etc.*, intellexi aliquid deesse quod de tuo sit addendum. Omnia autem, si placet, cum Achille ac Nestore nostro Domino V(an der Hoolck)¹⁹ communicabis,

263 Van der Hoolck] V.L. CLE

¹⁸ From Descartes' answer to the first point of Voetius' second thesis, Regius only followed his advice to supply all texts from the Holy Scriptures referred to by Voetius. Descartes cites from the Vulgate.

¹⁹ According to Baillet (*Vie*, II, 153) and a simple reference in *ExI*, the initials 'V.L.' in CLE stand for 'Van Leeuw', but an additional note in *ExI* maintains, referring to R/D 32, that Van der Hoolck is meant (*ExI*, I, 414, *in margine*: 'Van Leeuw // Vander Hoolck. V. le commencement de la lettre 16 de celles de M^r Le Roy a M. Desc. p. 40'). The person in question is almost certainly Van der Hoolck, who repeatedly protected Regius' interests. Clerselier must have misread the initials 'V.H.' in the draft. 'Van Leeuw' is probably Peter van Leeuwen (1592–1652), alderman (*schepen*) in Utrecht since 1640, and in 1652 elected as Burgomaster (VANDE WATER 1729, 185, 193, 197). His connection to Descartes is reported only by

et nihil planè nisi ex eius consilio suscipies; vel sanè, si quid sit quod
 265 ipse nolit scire, Domini Æmilij viri prudentissimi | nobisque amicissimi 415
 consilio uteris; et ipsis multò magis quam mihi credes, quia praevalent
 ingenio, et ibi praesentes de omnibus faciliùs possunt iudicare, quam
 ego absens divinare. Non puto te nimis honorificè de Voëtio loqui posse,
 velimque etiam ut caveas ne quam ea in re ironiae des suspicionem, nisi
 270 quatenus ex bonitate tuae causae nascetur; ut postea si nos cogat mutare
 stilum, tantò meliori iure id possimus, et ipse tantò magis ridiculus
 evadat. Expedit etiam ut tua responsio quamprimùm edatur, et ante
 finem feriarum, si fieri potest.²⁰

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter is the reply to R/D 30 (24 January NS). Not satisfied with Regius' draft of a response to Voetius' *Appendix*, Descartes prepares an alternative version. In doubt whether Regius will actually make use of it, Descartes does not endorse the project after his response to the first point of Voetius' second thesis (ll. 234–258). He asks Regius to inform him as soon as possible of his intentions. Regius' reply, R/D 32, dates from 2 February NS, and consequently the present letter was written between 24 January and 2 February 1641.

Text: the reconstruction of D/R 31 and D/R 33

In CLE and AT, D/R 31 and D/R 33 are patched together as one text (AT no. 266). Adam and Tannery, however, suggest that the text presented by Clerselier consists of two different letters. I arrive at the same conclusion, and additional arguments warrant actually dividing AT no. 266 into two separate letters, D/R 31 and D/R 33.

The key-problem in AT no. 266 is the discrepancy between Descartes' plain support for Regius' plan to publish a response to Voetius in the paragraph *Caeterum in his* (D/R 31, last paragraph), and his strong advice against the same project in the next paragraph (*Miratus sum*, D/R 33). Descartes' change of mind may be explained in two ways: either by assuming that in *Miratus sum* Descartes reacts to a second letter of Regius, which he received after completing his letter, or by considering *Miratus sum* as a separate letter.

Baillet, who states that Van Leeuw and Van der Hoolck submitted a copy of the *Epistola ad Voetium* to the Utrecht magistrates (*Vie*, II, 190; cf. AT VIII B 214). According to Baillet, Van Leeuw figures in a letter by Regius as well (R/D 51). On 5/15 June 1643, the same Van Leeuw was appointed member of a committee to investigate Descartes' claims in the *Epistola ad Voetium* (*Resolutiën*, 182).

²⁰ The winter holiday would end on 1/11 February. The *Responsio* appeared on 16/26 February 1642 (see R/D 36).

Adam and Tannery take the latter stand (cf. AT III 519).²¹ They regard *Miratus sum* as the reply to R/D 32, which in turn seems to respond to *Caeterum in his*, for in R/D 32 Regius writes he has met with Van der Hoolck, just as Descartes had asked him to do in *Caeterum in his*. Moreover, in *Miratus sum* Descartes shows his surprise about Van der Hoolck's warning — related in R/D 32 — that any reply to Voetius would endanger Regius' position at the university.

Adam and Tannery could have presented their case more firmly by pointing out three other elements. First, in R/D 32 Regius recounts his meeting with Van der Hoolck, who disapproved of the whole plan, even if the response would be drawn up along the lines suggested by Descartes. Consequently, when Regius met with Van der Hoolck, he had received Descartes' alternative response. Next, in R/D 32 (ll. 15–18) Regius mentions next to Van der Hoolck's opinion also Æmilius' point of view, thus acting upon Descartes' advice in *Caeterum in his* (D/R 31, ll. 266–267). Finally, despite Van der Hoolck's warning, Regius wishes to pursue the publication of his response, albeit that he considers publishing it under the name of one of his former students (R/D 32A, ll. 26–28). In *Miratus sum* Descartes rejects this idea: Regius should publish the work neither under his own name nor under someone else's (D/R 33, ll. 6–7). The ensemble of these indications warrants the division of AT no. 266, and to consider *Miratus sum* as a separate letter in reply to R/D 32.

The division of AT no. 266 into two separate letters solves the discrepancy between *Caeterum in his* and *Miratus sum*, but it also raises a new question. In *Miratus sum* Descartes promises Regius some *notulas extemporaneas* that occurred to him when he compared Regius' draft with Voetius' theses (D/R 33, ll. 8–10). Obviously, these notes cannot be the material Descartes sent along with D/R 31. Following a suggestion by Adam and Tannery (AT III 520), I maintain that Clerselier incorporated these notes in the text of AT no. 266. In Descartes' work on the response to Voetius in AT no. 266, we can distinguish two parts which differ sharply in their approach. The first part concerns Descartes' own reply to Voetius' theses, with no regard for Regius' draft.²² And this is exactly what Descartes had announced he would do: not try to amend Regius' text but compose an alternative reply (D/R 31, ll. 49–52). In AT no. 266, this plan is suddenly abandoned after Descartes' answer to the first point of Voetius' second thesis. The remaining part as far as the paragraph *Caeterum in his* no longer constitutes a coherent essay, but a collection of remarks with several references to Regius' draft.²³ These remarks concern suggestions, additions and corrections for the benefit of Regius' own response.²⁴ While this is out of line with Descartes' earlier announcement that he will not discuss Regius' draft, it is in accordance with Regius' request in R/D 32 (ll. 24–26) to

21 De Vrijer adopts their view in his article on a rediscovered copy of Regius' *Responsio* (DE VRIJER 1929). Although acquainted with DE VRIJER 1929, Milhaud refrains from separating the texts, but confines himself to outlining the two possible explanations for the discrepancy (AM V, 137, n. 2).

22 This part of AT no. 266 now constitutes D/R 31, ll. 63–258.

23 This part of AT no. 266 now constitutes D/R 33, ll. 23–158.

24 This is clearly shown by the following expressions in D/R 33: *addi potest* (l. 27); *vellem explicare* (l. 48); *ut ais* (l. 53); *non suadeo*, (l. 59); *nollem itaque ut reijceres ... sed ponerem* (ll. 88–90); *et hic subiungi potest quae habes de motu cordis* (ll. 103–104); *pro his verbis ... ponerem* (ll. 129–130).

send him the corrections he needed to publish his response. The *notulas* seem therefore to be this second part in AT no. 266.

If we consider the second part of AT no. 266 we mentioned as the *notulas* referred to in D/R 33, D/R 31 becomes more coherent. In *Caeterum in his* (D/R 31, ll. 259–262) Descartes says that he will complete his alternative response if Regius want him to. If AT no. 266 is a unity, Descartes' promise would be surprising, given the fact that he was almost finished. However, the offer to finish the job and the question which language he should use make sense when read right after the first part in AT no. 266, where Descartes works on an alternative response, which Regius could reproduce, but was still in need of the greater part of the response to Voetius' theses. If my reconstruction is correct, the message of R/D 32 would be that Regius did not wish to take any more of Descartes' precious time in asking him to complete the alternative response; he could adjust his draft himself, provided Descartes would send him corrections, if anywhere necessary. Consequently, I transferred the *notulas* to D/R 33 (ll. 23ff.).

As I pointed out above, the discrepancy in AT no. 266 has been explained differently. The view that AT no. 266 is a single letter, is defended by Rodis-Lewis and Dibon.²⁵ Both authors claim that AT no. 266 is the reply to R/D 30 and to a second letter, in which Regius relates the possible repercussions of any response to Voetius. Rodis-Lewis does not consider the discrepancy between *Caeterum in his* and *Miratus sum* as a prohibitive objection against the unity of AT no. 266, as Descartes seems to acknowledge his dual approach when he writes *notulas tamen extemporaneas [...] mitto* (D/R 33, ll. 8–9).²⁶ While Rodis-Lewis believes that Regius' second letter is R/D 32, Dibon supposes that the second letter is lost. According to Dibon, R/D 32, in which Regius urges Descartes to send him the corrections to his draft, crossed AT no. 266. Both authors, however, leave much unexplained. Rodis-Lewis' observation is correct, but it offers no explanation for the fact that R/D 32 seems to be written in reaction to *Caeterum in his*. Dibon needs to solve the additional question that *Miratus sum* appears to be the reply to R/D 32. In order to uphold his claim that R/D 32 is not in any way connected to AT no. 266, Dibon discredits Baillet by stating that he apparently tampered with the actual course of events, or made things up himself. Like Rodis-Lewis, Dibon fails to supply any substantial argument for his claims.²⁷

²⁵ RL, 100, n. 1; DIBON 1985 (reprinted in DIBON 1990, 551–577).

²⁶ Rodis-Lewis also notices that, as Descartes refers on several occasions to Regius' draft in AT no. 266, the *notulas* referred to in *Miratus sum* need not be distinguished from Descartes' own work in AT no. 266 (contra Adam and Tannery). This is a fine *prima facie* observation, but it leaves Descartes' announcement that he will not discuss Regius' draft unaccounted for.

²⁷ DIBON 1985 is more fully discussed in my commentary on D/R 35.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

[23 January/] 2 February 1642

Vie, II, 150–152 [A], 297 [B] (no. 16).
 AT, III, 525–527 [A] (no. 268).

[A]

M. Regius, qui croyait que le projet de réponse qu’il avait envoyé à M. Descartes était un chef-d’œuvre de modération, en ce qu’il s’était abstenu d’y parler avec aigreur, et d’y faire mention des corollaires et de l’appendice des thèses, fut assez surpris de la manière dont M. Descartes lui en expliquait ses sentiments.¹ Il alla trouver
 5 incontinent le Consul M. VanderHoolck, sous prétexte de lui porter les compliments de M. Descartes, et le consulta sur ce qu’il avait à faire. M. Vander-Hoolck, qui s’était trouvé à une délibération faite depuis quelques jours avec les autres Magistrats de la ville pour assoupir les troubles de l’Université et pour
 10 | recommander aux trois Professeurs de théologie² de veiller à la conservation de la religion protestante contre les nouveautés dangereuses, [*i.m.*: Narrat. hist. Acad. Traject. p. 52, 53.]³ lui parut fort réservé sur son sujet; et il se contenta de lui dire qu’il courait
 15 [L.m.: Lettr. 16 MS. de Reg.] M. Emilius, Professeur en éloquence et en histoire, à qui M. Regius avait fait voir son écrit avant que de l’envoyer à M. Descartes, jugeait pareillement qu’il était dangereux de faire une réponse, et que rien n’était plus propre que le silence pour calmer l’orage.

Ces avis ne changèrent point la résolution de M. Regius, qui jugea que si sa
 20 réponse n’était bonne pour le public, elle serait au moins de quelque utilité pour ses écoliers. Voyant qu’on en parlait déjà tout publiquement à Amsterdam et à La Haye, d’où M. de Zuytlichem,⁴ M. Rivet,⁵ M. Pollot et d’autres amis et sectateurs

1 D/R 31.

2 Voetius, Meinardus Schotanus and Dematius.

3 *Querelle*, 116. Shortly after Voetius’ disputation of 24 December 1641 OS, the Burgomasters met with the professors of theology, proposing that they define the limits of Regius’ teaching in philosophy. The theologians promised to draw up a memorandum to this effect.

4 Constantijn Huygens.

5 André Rivet (1572–1651), French Calvinist theologian, who accepted a chair of theology at Leiden University in 1620. In 1632, he became the tutor of Prince William II. NNBW, VII, 1051–1052; BLGNP, II, 375–378. The inventory of his correspondence (DIBON 1971) includes letters to and from Van Schurman, Huygens, Voetius, Mersenne, and a letter of thanks to Descartes after receiving several copies of the

de la nouvelle philosophie avaient déjà mandé à Utrecht qu'on leur envoyât cette réponse avec les thèses de Voetius, il en écrivit à M. Descartes le 2 de Février, et le
 25 supplia qu'à telle fin que ce pût être, il voulût la corriger, et la lui renvoyer en l'état qu'il croyait qu'on pourrait la publier. Il lui proposa en même temps de la faire paraître sous un nom étranger, et de prendre celui de *Hornius* ou VanHoorn, qui était celui de l'un de ses anciens écoliers demeurant pour lors à Leyde.⁶ Enfin il le conjura de considérer que, s'il avait fait quelques fautes dans toutes ses démarches,
 30 elles ne venaient que du zèle extraordinaire qu'il avait pour publier et faire recevoir sa philosophie; et que, ne s'étant attiré la haine des autres Professeurs que pour avoir préféré ses principes à ceux de la philosophie ancienne, il était de la justice et de son intérêt même de ne le point abandonner dans des besoins si pressants.

Pour lui faire paraître l'injustice de Voetius dans une plus grande évidence,
 35 il la lui fit considérer dans trois circonstances. Premièrement, Voetius ayant lu la *Physiologie* de Regius et une partie de sa *Physique*, que Vander-Hoolck lui avait conseillé de soumettre à son examen pour voir si tout | était conforme à l'Écriture 152 sainte, loin d'y trouver rien à redire, il avait permis, pendant son Rectorat même, qu'on en fit des disputes publiques.⁷ Secondement, il avait souffert, avant son
 40 Rectorat, et encore depuis, que M. Ravensperger soutint publiquement et en sa présence même le mouvement circulaire de la terre.⁸ En troisième lieu, ayant appris que la thèse où l'on avait disputé si *l'Homme est un Etre de soi, ou par accident*, lui avait déplu, il était allé trouver le lendemain les trois Professeurs en théologie [*i.m.*: Main. Schotanus, Charl. Dematius, Gisb. Voetius.] pour leur faire
 45 des excuses, et les assurer qu'il n'avait eu aucune intention de choquer les vérités théologiques. D'ailleurs, que la thèse avait été insérée par son répondant sans sa participation; mais qu'au reste il était prêt de réparer cette faute en la manière qu'ils jugeraient à propos. Les Professeurs avaient regardé la chose tous trois avec assez d'indifférence. Mainard Schotanus s'était contenté de dire que la chose
 50 n'était pas de grande conséquence. Dematius passant outre avait approuvé même la conduite de Regius en ce point. Et Voetius, quoique déjà déclaré contre lui, avait dit seulement qu'il ne voulait point se mêler de cette affaire.⁹ Cependant on avait vu

Principia (19 January 1645, AT IV 726–727). On Descartes and Rivet in particular, see DIBON 1990, 343–357.

6 On Johannes van Horn, see D/R 24, n. 1.

7 See my discussion of the date of D/R 17.

8 In 1640, Ravensberger defended the Copernican view as a possibility (RAVENSBERGER 1640), proposing it even more carefully the next year (RAVENBERGER 1641; cf. VERBEEK 1992A, 105). Ravensberger's reservations prevented an open conflict with Voetius.

9 According to NH, Regius apologised to Voetius immediately after the disputation, saying that he had taken the idea from Gorlaeus' *Exercitationes* without realising that it posed a threat to theology (see my commentary on D/R 29). NH continues: 'Idem praestitit die postero, cum Theologum [Voetius] domi suae

paraître peu de jours après, et contre l'intention même du Magistrat, les corollaires injurieux de ses thèses, sans parler d'un autre écrit dont les corollaires furent
 55 suivis, sous le titre d'*Appendix ad Corollaria Theologico-Philosophica nuperae disputationi de Jubileo Romano subjecta, etc.*¹⁰

[B]

Pour M. Pollot, qui était encore l'un des amis de M. Descartes [*i.m.*: Tom. 3 des
 lettr. p. 461, 622.¹¹] qui eussent le plus accès auprès de la Princesse¹² pour les
 sciences, et qui s'était intéressé très efficacement auprès du Prince d'Orange et
 de quelques amis d'Utrecht dans l'affaire de M. Descartes contre Voetius [*i.m.*:
 5 Lettr. MS. de Reg. du 2 Févr. 1642.] ...¹³

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 2 February 1642, without indication of the calendar used, but the letter is written before D/R 35 ([6 February]), and consequently its precise date is [23 January/] 2 February 1642.

Text

Text B is not in AT.

super hoc negotio cum eo collaturus, et consilium, uti prae se ferebat, petiturus inuiseret; ubi etiam de paradoxa ipsius Philosophiâ in genere, deque ratione et Methodo, quâ eam tradebat per sceleta definitionum et dichotomiarum, absque demonstrationibus, nonnulla obiter dicta sunt. Sed nihil nisi pervicaciam, non sine maledictis, reposuit. Alter ex Theologiae professoribus [Dematius or Schotanus] de eodem paradoxo cum Medico domi suae conferens, et salubre consilium illi suggerens, tantundem ferè abstulit. Quin et postridie, qui tertius erat à disputatione dies, in ordinariâ lectione problematicâ idem paradoxum pro virili astruebat, et auditoribus inculcabat.' (NH, 23–24/*Querelle*, 94).

¹⁰ Cf. D/R 31, n. 7.

¹¹ Descartes to Elizabeth, [November 1643], AT IV 37; to De Wilhem, 15 June 1646, AT IV 435–436. The version of the letter to De Wilhem, published in CLE, mentions 'Monsieur Pollot', but this is a mistake made by Clerselier, because the autograph reads 'Mr Pell'. The mistake led Baillet, in the continuation of the passage quoted above, to the belief that Pollot was appointed professor of philosophy at the newly founded Illustrious School at Breda (1646). On the mathematician John Pell (1610–1685) and the Illustrious School of Breda, see DNB, 44, 261–263, DBPh, II, 638–641 and SASSEN 1962.

¹² Elizabeth, Princess of Bohemia (1618–1680), who lived with her family in exile in The Hague.

¹³ See D/R 31, n. 1.

CLE, I, 410–414, 415 (no. 89-II).

AT, III, 509–510, 503–509 (no. 266-II).

AM, V, 137–138, 125–135; RL, 100, 86–98; CSMK, 207–209 (partly); B, 181–183, 164–180.

Miratus sum admodum quod scribas te de tuâ professione periclitari, [510]
 si Voëtio respondeas; nesciebam enim illum in vestra Civitate regnare,
 magisque liberam putabam; et miseret me eius, quod Paedagogo tam
 vili ac tam misero tyranno servire sustineat. Te, quoniam in eâ vivis,
 5 ad patientiam hortor, atque ut ea tantum facias quae Dominis tuis magis
 placitura esse existimabis. Idcirco non modò non per te, sed ne quidem
 etiam per alium, Voëtio respondendum censeo, quia hoc illum non minùs
 offenderet. Notulas tamen extemporaneas, quae mihi tuum scriptum
 cum omnibus Thesibus conferendo occurrerunt, mitto, ut ipsis utaris
 10 ut lubet. Iniuriam autem facis nostrae Philosophiae, si eam nolentibus
 obrudas, imo si communices aliis quam enixè rogantibus.¹ Memini te
 olim mihi gratias egisse, quod eius causâ professionem fuisses adeptus,
 atque ideo putabam illam Dominis tuis non esse ingratham.² Nam si aliter
 se res habet, et malint te id quod placet Voëtio, quam quod verius putas,
 15 docere, censeo ut morem geras, et vel fabulas Æsopi potiùs legas, quam
 ut ipsis eâ in re displiceas.

Quae habes in fine tuae Epistolae de globulis aethereis, non intel-
 ligo; quia non censeo illos à materia subtilissima moveri, sed à se ipsis,
 cum motum habeant ab exordio mundi sibi inditum. Nec etiam maiores
 20 vehementiùs moveri quam minores, sed absolutè contrarium puto: dixi
 quidem in Meteoris, maiores, cum magis sunt agitati, maiorem calorem
 efficere, sed non ideò faciliùs moveri.³ Vale.

2. Veretur ne, si formas substantiales in rebus purè materialibus nege- [503]
 mus, dubitare etiam possimus, an detur aliqua in homine, illorumque

1 Cf. the last sentence in Regius' *Responsio* (p. 40): 'Non enim illa tam vilia putamus, ut nolentibus, vel etiam non obnixè rogantibus sint obrudenda'.

2 Cf. R/D 1.

3 *Météores*, I, AT VI 234ff.

25 *errores qui Animam Mundi Universalem aut quid simile imaginantur, non tam foeliciter et tutò retundere, quam assertores formarum.*⁴

Ad secundum addi potest, econtrà ex opinione affirmante formas substantiales, facillimum esse prolapsum in opinionem eorum qui dicunt Animam humanam esse Corpoream et Mortalem; quae cum agnoscitur sola esse forma substantialis, alias autem ex partium configuratione et motu constare, maxima haec eius supra alias praerogativa ostendit ipsam ab iis natura differre, et naturae differentia viam aperit facillimam ad eius Immaterialitatem Immortalitatemque demonstrandam, ut in Meditationibus de primâ Philosophiâ nuper editis videri potest; adeò ut nulla excogitari possit, hac de re, opinio Theologiae magis favens.

Ad quintum. Absurdum sanè sit pro iis qui ponunt formas substantiales, si dicant ipsas esse immediatum suarum actionum principium; non autem absurdum esse potest pro iis qui formas istas à qualitatibus activis non distinguunt. Nos autem qualitates activas non negamus, sed negamus tantum ipsis Entitatem aliquam maiorem quam Modalem esse tribuendam; hoc enim fieri non potest nisi tanquam substantiae concipiantur. Nec etiam negamus habitus, sed duplicis generis illos intelligimus: nempe alij sunt purè Materiales, qui à sola partium configuratione, aut alia dispositione, dependent; alij verò Immaterialiales, sive Spirituales, ut habitus fidei, gratiae etc. apud Theologos, qui ab eâ non pendent, sed sunt modi spirituales menti inexistentes, ut motus, aut figura, est modus corporeus corpori inexisterens. [504]

Ad octavum. Vellem explicare, quomodo etiam automata sint opera naturae, et homines in iis fabricandis nihil aliud faciant quam applicare activa passivis; ut etiam faciunt dum triticum seminant, vel mulum generari curant; quod nullam differentiam essentialem, sed tantum à natura inductam affert, valdè tamen facit differre secundum magis et minùs, ut ais, quia paucae illae rotae in horologio cum innumeris ossibus, nervis, venis, arteriis, etc. vilissimi animalculi nullomodo sunt comparandae. Loca autem Scripturae quae citat, essent hîc rursus omnia afferenda, ut calumnia appareat; nihil enim urgent.

Ad decimum. Eodem titulo Geometria et Mechanicae omnes essent reiiciendae; quod quàm ridiculum et à ratione alienum nemo non videt. Nec hoc sine risu possem praetermittere, sed non suadeo.

4 Cf. D/R 13, n. 7.

60 *Ad undecimum.* Non dicimus Terram à situ, positurâ et figurâ moveri, sed tantum disponi ad motum. Nec verò est circulus, unam rem ab unâ moveri, et ab aliâ disponi ad motum. Nec etiam vitiosus est circulus, quod unum corpus moveat aliud, et hoc moveat tertium, et hoc tertium moveat rursus primum, si prius moveri desierit; ut neque est
65 circulus, quod unus homo pecuniam tradat alteri, quam hic alter tradat tertio, qui tertius primo rursus tradere potest.

Ad duodecimum. Qui dicunt per haec principia nihil explicari, legant nostra Meteora, et conferant cum Aristotelis Meteoris; item Dioptricam cum aliorum scriptis, qui de eâdem materiâ scripserunt:
70 et agnoscent opprobrium omne opinionibus à naturâ diversis remanere. [505]

AD TERTIAM THESIM. Rationes omnes, ad probandas formas substantiales, applicari possunt formae horologij, quam tamen nemo dicet substantialem.

AD QUARTAM THESIM. Rationes, sive demonstrationes Physicae,
75 *contra formas substantiales, quas intellectum veritatis avidum planè cogere arbitramur, sunt in primis hae à priori Metaphysicae, sive Theologicae.* Quod planè repugnet ut substantia aliqua de novo existat, nisi | de novo à Deo creetur; videmus autem quotidie multas ex illis
80 formis, quae substantiales dicuntur, de novo incipere esse, quamvis à Deo creari non putentur ab iis qui putant ipsas esse substantias; ergo malè hoc putant. Quod confirmatur exemplo Animae, quae est vera forma substantialis hominis; haec enim non aliam ob causam à Deo immediatè creari putatur, quam quia est substantia; ac proinde, cum aliae non putentur eodem modo creari, sed tantùm educi e potentiâ materiae, non putandum etiam est eas esse substantias. Atque hinc patet
85 non eos qui formas substantiales negant, sed potius eos qui affirmant, *eò tandem per solidas consequentias adigi posse, ut fiant aut Bestiae, aut Athei.* Nollem itaque ut reiceres argumentum ab ortu formarum petitum, nec Thersiticum appellares,⁵ quia videtur ad hoc referri; sed

76–77 hae ... Theologicae] haec à priori Metaphysica, sive Theologica CLE

5 Voetius calls the principal argument against substantial forms ‘Achillean’: ‘Ratio, et quidem palmaria ac Achillea, est: quia ortus, seu modus originis formarum non potest explicari, aut ita demonstrari, ut difficultas nulla supersit’ (*Thesis* 4, NH, 43/AT III 515/*Querelle*, 109). Regius may have called Voetius’ counterargument *Thersiticum*, since in posthomeric tradition Achilles (and not Odysseus as in the *Iliad* (2, 212–277)), kills the malicious Thersites. Or perhaps Regius alludes to Voetius’ work *Thersites heautontimorumenos* (VOETIUS 1635). In any case, Regius complied with Descartes’ wish to stick to the matter at hand.

90 ponerem tantùm, ea quae ab aliis eâ de re dicta sunt nos non tangere, [506]
 quoniam ipsos non sequimur. Altera demonstratio petitur à fine, sive
 usu, formarum substantialium; non enim aliam ob causam introductae
 sunt à Philosophis, quam ut per illas reddi posset ratio actionum propri-
 arum rerum naturalium, quarum haec forma esset principium et radix, ut
 95 habetur in Thesi praecedenti. Sed nullius planè actionis naturalis ratio
 reddi potest per illas formas substantiales, cum earum assertores fatean-
 tur ipsas esse occultas, et à se non intellectas; nam si dicant aliquam
 actionem procedere à forma substantiali, idem est ac si dicerent, illam
 procedere à re à se non intellectâ, quod nihil explicat. Ergo formae illae
 100 ad causas actionum naturalium reddendas nullomodo sunt inducendae.
 Contra autem à formis illis essentialibus, quas nos explicamus, manifes-
 tae ac Mathematicae rationes redduntur actionum naturalium, ut videre
 est de forma salis communis in meis Meteoris⁶. Et hîc subiungi potest
 quae habes de motu Cordis.

105 *AD QUINTAM THESIM.* Quod tam saepe iactat de *doctâ igno-*
rantiâ, dignum est explicatione. Nempe, cum scientia humana sit ad-
 modùm limitata, et totum | id quod scitur, ferè nihil sit, comparatum 413
 cum iis quae ignorantur, doctrinae signum est, quod quis liberè fateatur
 se ignorare illa quae re verâ ignorat: et in hoc propriè docta ignorantia
 110 consistit, quia scilicet est peculiaris eorum qui verè docti sunt. Nam [507]
 alij qui vulgò doctrinam profitentur, nec tamen verè docti sunt, non
 valentes ea dignoscere, quae nemo eruditus ignorat, ab iis quae sine
 dedecore vir doctus fateri potest se ignorare, omnia ex aequo se scire
 profitentur; atque ad facilè reddendas omnium rerum rationes (si tamen
 115 ratio ullius rei reddatur, cum explicatur obscurum per obscurius), for-
 mas substantiales et qualitates reales excogitârunt; quâ in re ipsorum
 ignorantia nequaquam docta, sed tantum superba et paedagogica dici
 debet;⁷ in hoc enim manifesta superbia est, quod ex eo solo, quod na-
 turam alicuius qualitatis ignorent, concludunt ipsam esse occultam, hoc
 120 est omnibus hominibus imperscrutabilem, tanquam si ipsorum cognitio
 esset mensura omnis humanae cognitionis.

AD SEXTAM. Non video hominis ratiocinium in iis quae de me

⁶ Cf. *Méteores*, III, 'Du sel', AT VI 249–264.

⁷ In the *Epistola ad Voetium* (AT VIII B 42–46/*Querelle* 351–353), Descartes gives an elaborate analysis of the difference between Voetius' pedantry (*paedagogica ignorantia*) and the 'learned ignorance' of the real *eruditus* or *doctus*. Cf. VERBEEK 1993E.

inseririt. Ait me in Dissertatione de Methodo non satis evidenter demonstrasse esse Deum, quod ipse etiam ibi professus sum. Quid autem ad hoc spectans inferri potest ex his verbis, *cogito ergo sum?* Et quam malè hîc citat et mihi opponit tractatum Patris Mersenni et suum, cum suus adhuc in herbâ sit, et Mersennus nullum planè præter meas Meditationes de prima Philosophia edi curaverit.⁸

AD SEPTIMAM. Pro his verbis: *ipsa tamen, ut verum fatear etc.*,
 130 ponerem: De ipsâ tamen nihil simile opinionibus Taurelli aut Gori- [508]
 laei sustinimus, nihilque omnino quod in re à vulgari et orthodoxâ
 Philosophorum omnium sententiâ dissideat. Asserimus enim hominem
 ex Corpore et Anima componi, non per solam præsentiam, sive ap-
 propinquationem, unius ad alterum, sed per veram unionem substan-
 135 tialem; (*ad quam quidem ex parte corporis requiritur naturaliter situs
 et partium conformatio, sed quæ ta- | men sit diversa à situ et figurâ mo- 414
 disque aliis purè corporeis: non enim solum Corpus, sed etiam Animam,
 quæ incorporea est, attingit*). Quantum autem ad modum loquendi, etsi
 fortè sit minùs usitatus, ad id tamen quod significare voluimus satis ap-
 140 tum fuisse existimamus. Non enim diximus hominem esse *ens per
 accidens*, nisi ratione partium, animæ scilicet et corporis: ut nempe
 significarem, unicuique ex his partibus esse quodammodò accidenta-
 rium, quod alteri iuncta sit, quia seorsim potest subsistere, et id vocatur
 accidens, quod adest vel abest sine subiecti corruptione. Sed quatenus
 145 homo in se totus consideratur, omnino dicimus ipsum esse unum *Ens
 per se*, et non per accidens; quia unio, qua corpus humanum et anima
 inter se coniunguntur, non est ipsi accidentaria, sed essentialis, cum
 homo sine ipsâ non sit homo. Sed quoniam multò plures in eo errant,
 quod putent animam à corpore non distingui realiter, quam in eo quod
 150 admissa eius distinctione unionem substantialem negent; maiorisque
 est momenti ad refutandos illos qui animas mortales putant, docere istam
 distinctionem partium in homine, quam docere unionem; maiorem
 me gratiam initurum esse sperabam à Theologis, dicendo hominem
 esse *ens per accidens*, ad designandam istam distinctionem, quam si, [509]

⁸ The second part of the sentence is usually translated with 'Mersenne has published nothing on first philosophy except my Meditations' (cf. AM V 133; RL, 97; B, 177), which is incorrect, as *Meditationes de prima Philosophia* is, just like a few paragraphs earlier (l. 34), simply the title of Descartes' work edited by Mersenne in 1641. In the *Responsio* Regius rephrased Descartes' remark as follows: 'Denique non satis bene tractatus P. Mersenni hic adversus ipsum [sc. Descartes] citari videntur: cum ille nullum plane contra ipsum, sed tantum ipsas Renati Meditationes hactenus edi curaverit' (p. 32).

155 respiciendo ad partium unionem, dixissem illum esse ens *per se*. Atque ita non meum est respondere ad ea quae in opiniones Taurelli et Gorlaei fuse obiiciuntur, sed tantummodò conqueri, quod tam immeritò ac tam severè mihi aliorum errores affingantur.

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter is in reply to R/D 32 (2 February). In D/R 35, dated [6 February], Descartes refers to the present letter, and consequently it dates from 3 or 4 February 1642.

Text

See my commentary on D/R 31.

34
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
6 February 1642

MS (copy), Library of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District and the Reformed College,
Debrecen, R 164, f. 259v.
Published in ESZE 1973 and DIBON 1985/DIBON 1990, 551–577.
B, 186–187.

Vir Clarissime,

Nihil jam de Voetio, nec de Philosophia loquar, sed tantum dicam
Dominum Picot mihi amicissimum, et quem, si quem alium in mundo,
maximi facio, aliquamdiu apud vos manere velle, ut experiatur an aura
5 Ultrajectensis amoenior sit quam Lugdunensis;¹ Sed eâ tantum fiducia
ad Vos ire quod putet si tibi per me sit commendatus, te libenter curatu-
rum, ut hospitium aliquod inveniat, in quo ad aliquot hebdomadas aut
menses satis commode possit habitare. Dicit ipse melius quale optet
quam ego possem scribere, sed moneo tantum officia omnia quae in
10 ipsum contuleris mihi fore gratiora quam si eadem in me contulisses.

Vale et amare perge,

Ex domo Endegeest
6. Februarii 1642.

Ex asse tuum
Des Cartes

7 aliquot] aliquott MS 11 perge.] perge. MS

1 For Claude Picot, see the *Biographical Lexicon*. On Picot's stay in Utrecht, see my commentary.

COMMENTARY

Date

The date is found on the manuscript copy.²

*Context**Picot and the Utrecht students of Descartes' Géométrie*

D/R 34 is a letter of recommendation for Picot, who may have handed it over to Regius in person. Regrettably, we have no first hand information on the contacts between Picot and Regius, which would be interesting because Picot witnessed the height of the Utrecht crisis during his stay in Utrecht. According to Baillet — who had no knowledge of Picot's stay in Utrecht — Regius and Picot became quite close (see R/D 44F).

While we have no indication of Picot's occupations during his stay in Leiden and Endegeest, we do know that he spent part of his time in Utrecht to master Descartes' *Géométrie*. It follows from the fact that a second letter of recommendation for Picot, equally dated 6 February 1642, is addressed to a certain Roderich Dotzen, in which Descartes asks Dotzen to act as an interpreter between Picot and Jacobus van Waessenaer, who will introduce Picot to 'le calcul de ma Geometrie' (AT III 736).³ Roderich Dotzen (1618–1670) was a German nobleman and a student of mathematics and philosophy living in Utrecht. On 25 March 1642, Descartes wrote another letter to Dotzen, which shows that Picot is still in Utrecht.⁴

During the late 1630s and early 1640s, Descartes' *Géométrie* was studied thoroughly by a number of people in Utrecht, who all knew Descartes personally. They are Reneri,⁵ Godefroot van Haestrecht, Jacob van Waessenaer, Alphonse Pollot and Roderich Dotzen.⁶ Mention should also be made of the son of a lawyer in Utrecht, a

² For a description of the source, see my Introduction, § 2.4.

³ Descartes' letter to Dotzen is kept in the Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek in Hanover. The letter was first published by Heinekamp (HEINEKAMP 1970), who supplies relevant biographical information on Dotzen or Dozen. In 1640 Dotzen went to the Netherlands to join the Dutch army. From early 1642 till November 1643 he stayed in Utrecht — 'der Sammelplatz des Adels und gelehrter Leute' — to study mathematics and philosophy, but he does not seem to have matriculated at the university. In 1649 he returned to Utrecht and this time he matriculated (*Album Stud. Acad. Rhen.-Trai.*, 23) but there is no record that he obtained a degree. Because of financial problems — his father, the Burgomaster of Bremen, refused to support his stay abroad — Dotzen was forced to return prematurely to Germany. See also the following note.

⁴ '[...] i'ay quasi appris en mesme tems de vous et de Monsieur Picot, combien vous vous plaisez en conversation l'un de l'autre. Je ne doute point que le temps n'augmente de plus en plus vostre amitié', AT III 555. The autograph of the letter — Adam and Tannery reproduce a manuscript copy kept at the Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek in Hanover — was recently rediscovered by Herbert Breger, the director of the Hanover Leibniz Archives, in the Municipal Archives of Bremen. I am much obliged to Prof. Breger for informing me that the same archives preserve Dotzen's correspondence with Regius and Johannes de Raey as well (Dotzen to Regius, 16 October 1648; Regius to Dotzen, 20 December 1652, 1 Januari 1653; Dotzen to De Raey, 19 July 1649; De Raey to Dotzen, 2 August 1649). A publication on Dotzen's correspondence with Descartes, Regius and De Raey is forthcoming.

⁵ See his letters to Mersenne (AT II 101–102/CM VII 113–117) and De Wilhem (DIBON 1990, 216–218).

⁶ The Utrecht professors of mathematics, Bernardus Schotanus and Jacobus Ravensberger, had a professional interest in the *Géométrie*, but there is no evidence of any personal contacts with Descartes.

gifted mathematician according to Descartes.⁷ One of Descartes' friends in Utrecht, probably Van Haestrecht,⁸ is the author of an 'Introduction à la Géométrie', which is otherwise known as 'Le calcul de M. Descartes'. The plan to publish the work was never realised, but Descartes, who approved of the project, sent at least two copies to Mersenne.⁹ Picot's mathematical studies in Utrecht show that the circle was still active in 1642.

7 '... l'amitié que les Mathématiques m'ont fait autrefois avec Mr votre fils, qui les savait en perfection, et qui eut pu surpasser tous les autres, s'il eut vécu...'. Descartes to a Utrecht lawyer, 17 April 1646, AT IV 390. Descartes wrote to the lawyer of Schoock, in order to be informed of the progress of the lawsuit between Voetius and Schoock. A judicial document of 1645 reveals that Schoock's lawyer was a certain Van Rossum of whom we do not know anything (DUKER 1915, 198).

8 THUSSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 83–84; AM III, 323–327; COSTABEL 1988, 62–63. For Van Haestrecht, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

9 To Mersenne, 31 March 1638, AT II 89, 99/CM VII 126, 136, 27 May 1638, AT II 146, 152/CM VII 241, [13 July 1638], AT II 246/CM VII 340, 11 October 1638, AT II 392–393/CM VIII 108. Three copies of the *Calcul* survive: 1. copied for Leibniz, now in the Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek at Hanover, published in AT X 659–680; 2. in the British Library, published in AM III 323–352 (collated with the Hanover manuscript, with an introduction by G. Milhaud); 3. a copy in the Royal Library, The Hague, discovered by F. de Buzon (COSTABEL 1988, 63). Differences between the copies show that the *Calcul* was a work in progress. According to Costabel, the first two copies date from 1638, the third is later than 1641 (COSTABEL 1988, 62–63).

35
Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[6 February 1642]

MS (copy), Library of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District and the Reformed College,
Debrecen, R 164, f. 260r.
Published in ESZE 1973 and DIBON 1985/DIBON 1990, 551–577.
B, 187–188.

Vir Clarissime,

Jam ad te scripseram praecedentem epistolam, cum tuam accepi.¹ Misi
autem nuper ea pauca quae tuae responsioni addenda videbantur.² Jam
si vel minimum ob responsionem de tua professione possis periclitari, ut
5 nuper scripseras,³ quam maxime author sum ut sileas et servias tempori.
Sin minus puto ex iis quae jam scripsisti et notulis quas adjunxi, facile
compingi posse responsionem, sub quocunque volueris nomine eden-
dam.⁴ Sed interim non puto tibi valde metuendum esse, ne adversarius
triumphet si nihil ipsi respondeatur, neve rursus aliud quid in te scribat,
10 quo enim plura scripserit, tanto ampliorem nobis dabit materiam ad
suas ineptias ostendendas, ipsumque Stampione magis ridiculum red-
dendum.⁵ Si quando ad id vos cogat, nec ulla in re operam meam
recusabo, vide tantum ut quae unquam in lucem edidit simul colligas.
Sed jam sum aliis rebus occupatissimus. Vale.

COMMENTARY

Date

The manuscript copy does not mention the date, but as it was probably dispatched together with R/D 34 (see below), the date is 6 February 1642.⁶

-
- 1 References to D/R 34 and a lost letter by Regius. For the context of the present letter, see my commentary.
 - 2 The *notulas extemporaneas* (cf. l. 6 below) sent along with D/R 33 for the benefit of Regius' response to Voetius.
 - 3 Cf. R/D 32.
 - 4 Cf. D/R 33, ll. 8–10.
 - 5 For the Stampioen-affair, see my commentary on R/D 6. Cf. D/R 38, l. 25.
 - 6 For a description of the source, see my Introduction, § 2.4.

The disputed date of D/R 35

Deceived by the reference to Stampioen (l. 12), Esze misinterprets R/D 35 and places the letter in the context of the Stampioen-affair. As a result, she points to Van Waessenaer as the possible addressee of the letter.⁷ Dibon examined the letter anew, from the photographic reproduction published by Esze, and he correctly deduces that, like the other letter found in Debrecen (D/R 34), it is addressed to Regius and written in the context of the Utrecht quarrel.⁸ Dibon presumes that the letter is written in reply to R/D 32 (2 February), and antedates D/R 34 (6 February 1642).⁹ However, Dibon's conjecture is wrong: the letter was sent together with D/R 34 on 6 February 1642.

The present letter, D/R 35, is riddled with allusions to other letters, both by Regius and Descartes. We can distinguish references to four different letters: Descartes' own 'preceding letter' (*praecedentem epistolam*, l. 2) and a letter prior to that one (*Misi autem nuper*, ll. 2–3). Next, Descartes has just received a letter by Regius (*tuam [epistolam] accepi*, l. 1), which is to be distinguished from a previous letter (*ut nuper scripseras*, l. 4–5). Dibon's unraveling of these references is erratic and lacks substantial argumentation. But as his reconstruction affects all letters exchanged in January and February 1642, a brief discussion is in order, before presenting my own conclusions.

Crucial for Dibon's point of view is his assumption that AT no. 266, which I divided into D/R 31 and D/R 33, is one single letter. Dibon furthermore believes that in AT no. 266 Descartes replies to two letters: the first one, R/D 30, contained Regius' draft of his response to Voetius, in the second letter Regius would have told Descartes that any response might endanger his position. This last letter — lost according to Dibon — corresponds to Regius' letter referred to as *ut nuper scripseras*, D/R 35, l. 4–5. Next, the letter Descartes has just received (cf. l. 1) is R/D 32 (2 February), in which Regius asks the philosopher for the corrections he needs to complete his response to Voetius.¹⁰ To this, Descartes answers in the present letter that he has recently sent the material required: *Misi autem nuper* (l. 2–3), which must refer back to AT no. 266. Apparently, AT no. 266 had not yet reached Regius. Dibon is now left with one letter to account for: Descartes' own 'previous letter' (*praecedentem epistolam*, l. 1). According to Dibon, the letter — now lost — was sent shortly after AT no. 266 to confirm Regius he had dispatched the material in question.¹¹ As to the date of D/R 35, Dibon ventures the guess that it was written before D/R 34, where Descartes could rightly claim that he had nothing more to say on Voetius.

Dibon's reconstruction suffers from a variety of weaknesses. First, Dibon needs to assume the existence of two unknown and lost letters in order to account for all references in D/R 35. Next, Descartes' lost letter, the 'preceding letter', would have confirmed the sending AT no. 266, which is very unlikely as Descartes had not yet

⁷ ESZE 1973, 542.

⁸ DIBON 1985, 172–173, 182/DIBON 1990, 557–559, 569.

⁹ DIBON 1985, 189/DIBON 1990, 577.

¹⁰ DIBON 1985, 184–189/DIBON 1990, 571–577.

¹¹ 'La lettre de Regius du 2 février a apparemment croisé la lettre *précédente* dont Descartes fait mention. Ce dernier ne peut que confirmer son envoi récent (*nuper*) des annotations à la réponse à Voet', DIBON 1985, 186/DIBON 1990, 573–574.

received any impatient message from Regius. Finally, it is even more implausible that Regius sent Descartes no less than three letters (R/D 30, a letter lost, and R/D 32) before receiving anything back, and then subsequently receive one after another AT no. 266, a letter confirming the sending of AT no. 266, and at last D/R 35, which confirms the sending of both AT no. 266 and the preceding letter. None of these points in Dibon's reconstruction is backed by solid argumentation.¹²

The interpretation of D/R 35 is much easier if we accept the epistolary sequence established in the commentary on D/R 31 above: D/R 31 – R/D 32 – D/R 33. To start with the reference in D/R 35 that Regius had 'recently' written that his chair would be at stake if he published the *Responsio*: here Descartes must refer back to R/D 32 (2 February). Consequently, Regius' second letter, the one Descartes has just received, is of a later date, but still prior to the publication of the *Responsio*. Baillet does not mention a letter by Regius between 2 and 17/27 February, R/D 32 and R/D 36 respectively, but we do have an indication of its contents: Regius asked Descartes to send him the things he needs to complete the *Responsio* as soon as possible. Descartes answers in D/R 35 that he has already sent the material in question — characterised as *ea pauca*, and a few lines down as *notulis quas adjunxi* (l. 6). Descartes probably aims at the *notulas extemporaneas* sent along with D/R 33.¹³ If so, Regius' lost letter crossed D/R 33. This leaves us to identify Descartes' 'preceding letter', for which we have only one possible candidate: his letter of 6 February (D/R 34). The obvious explanation of Descartes' first words in D/R 35, *jam ad te scripseram praecedentem epistolam*, is that he had finished a letter to Regius but not yet sent it when Regius' letter arrived. Both letters will then have been dispatched together. That D/R 34 is the preceding letter mentioned in D/R 35, and that both letters were dispatched together, may account for the absence of both subscription and date in D/R 35.

¹² Dibon does mention that when Descartes writes in D/R 35 (ll. 7–8) that Regius may publish the response under any name he seems fit, he must be replying to R/D 32A (ll. 26–28), but Dibon neither explains nor indicates the fact that in the paragraph *Miratus sum* (D/R 33, ll. 1–16 — part of AT no. 266 according to Dibon), Descartes stipulates that Regius should not publish it under any name, a remark he could only have made *after* Regius had raised the subject (DIBON 1985, 187/DIBON 1990, 574–575).

¹³ D/R 33, ll. 9–10.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

17/27 February 1642

Vie, II, 153 (no. 17).
AT, III, 527–528 (no. 269).

[...] M. Regius, ayant enfin arraché le consentement de M. Emilius,¹ mit sa réponse sous la presse, d'où elle sortit le XVI de Février, et il en envoya dès le lendemain deux exemplaires à M. Descartes. [*l.m.*: Lettr. 17 de Reg. MS.]

L'écrit avait pour titre: *Responsio seu Notae in Appendicem ad Corollaria*
5 *Theologico-Philosophica, etc.*

COMMENTARY

Date

According to Baillet, Regius forwarded two copies of his reply to Voetius the day after it was published. The exact date of publication of the *Responsio* is 16/26 February 1642.²

¹ Cf. D/R 31, ll. 264–266, and R/D 32A, ll. 15–18.

² NH, 53/*Querelle*, 116. The copy of the *Responsio* in Utrecht University Library was acquired in 1900 at the auction of a collection assembled by Gerrit Dirk Bom (BOM 1900, no. 420; cf. DE WAARD 1947, 347, n. 5). The pamphlet is listed in Van Someren 1922 (no. 673a, 43; facsimile of the title page facing page 43). De Vrijer was unaware of the presence of the copy in Utrecht ('door mij niet gezien', DE VRIJER 1917, Bijlage IV), but after this was pointed out to him by Cornelis de Waard, De Vrijer devoted an article to the *Responsio* (DE VRIJER 1929).

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

[23 February/] 5 March 1642

Vie, II, 153–154 (no. 18).
 AT, III, 534–535 (no. 271).

[...] il [Voetius] crut qu'il fallait étouffer le livre¹ dans sa naissance; et prenant pour prétexte qu'il avait été imprimé sans ordre du Magistrat, que son imprimeur était un Catholique, et son marchand libraire un Remontrant,² il convoqua l'Assemblée générale de son Université, [*i.m.*: Les 18 et 19 de Février 1642.] où il se plaignit
 5 de cet écrit comme d'un libelle fait contre lui, contre la dignité rectorale, contre l'honneur des Professeurs et de toute l'Université, par un de ses collègues.³ [*I.m.*: Narrat. hist. Acad. pag. 53.⁴] Il en demanda la suppression et en même temps l'extermination de toute cette nouvelle philosophie qui troublait le repos de toute
 10 l'Université. Plusieurs souscrivirent à cet avis, et trois d'entre eux, [*i.m.*: Epist. 18 MS. Reg. ad Cart.] savoir Dematius ou de Maets Professeur en théologie, Mathaeus Pro-
 fesseur en droit, et Lyraeus Professeur en humanités, furent députés vers le
 15 Magistrat pour lui porter les plaintes de l'Assemblée.⁵ 154

Le Magistrat, pour les apaiser, envoya saisir 130 exemplaires du livre chez le libraire, qui dès le premier jour en avait débité 150, et en avait envoyé ensuite
 15 un grand nombre à Amsterdam et à La Haye. [*I.m.*: Ibid.] De sorte que ce qui resta d'exemplaires devint exorbitamment cher, et fit rechercher le livre comme une chose très rare et très précieuse. Ces circonstances, loin d'apaiser l'esprit de Voetius selon l'intention du Magistrat, ne servirent qu'à l'irriter, voyant que cette
 20 suppression faisait que le livre de Regius était couru avec plus d'empressement qu'auparavant, et qu'il était lu avec plus de soin.⁶ Il ne songea plus qu'à se venger également de M. Regius et de M. Descartes, et il assembla presque tous les jours

1 REGIUS 1642.

2 The Catholic printer is not identified, but the publisher is Jan Evertsz. van Doorn, who published several Remonstrant pamphlets and whose name figured in 1618 on the sheriff's blacklist of persons 'suspected of Arminianism'. In 1635, due to the more liberal climate, he became the dean of the guild of publishers. See EVERS 1918 and GRUYS/DE WOLF 1980, 30.

3 NH tells a different story: Voetius did not wish to be present at the gatherings of the Senate at first, to avoid precisely this kind of calumny (NH, 53/*Querelle*, 117). It seems likely, however, that NH mentions this explicitly to contradict Descartes' accusation in the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* that Voetius misused his authority as rector during the Senate's meetings (AT VII 589). Descartes' source of information is probably R/D 37.

4 *Querelle*, 117. See the previous note.

5 On 18/28 February 1642 (*Acta*, 149–150). NH relates that all the professors subscribed (see my commentary).

6 Cf. *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, AT VII 589.

son Université pour prendre de nouvelles délibérations contre la philosophie de ce dernier, sans qu'il fût permis à M. Regius d'y assister. [*I.m.*: Ibid.] Le XXI de Février il dressa un résultat de délibération qu'il fit signer par la plupart des
 25 Professeurs, pour pouvoir être présenté au Sénat ou Conseil de la ville au nom de l'Assemblée des quatre Facultés, afin qu'on pût obtenir une sentence du Magistrat, tant pour la proscription de la philosophie nouvelle, que pour la suppression de l'écrit de Regius comme d'un libelle injurieux au Recteur de l'Université, et capable de détourner la jeunesse d'aller prendre ses leçons.⁷ M. Regius écrivit le v
 30 de Mars suivant à M. Descartes pour l'informer du mauvais succès de sa réponse à Voetius, et de tout ce qui se passait à son désavantage; et pour le prier d'employer son crédit auprès de M. Vander-Hoolck et de ses autres amis pour détourner la tempête qui menaçait leur philosophie commune et sa personne particulière.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 5 March 1642, without indication of the calendar used. The subject of the letter is the actions taken by the Academic Senate after the publication of the *Responsio*. On 18 and 19 February OS the Senate gathered to discuss Regius' defence against Voetius, and they requested the Burgomasters — successfully — to seize the copies. The last event Baillet relates in connection with R/D 38 is another Senate's meeting on 21 February/3 March, which suggests that the letter was written on 23 February/5 March.

Another indication that New Style is meant, is Baillet's silence about a measure against Regius taken after 5 March NS. On 22, 23 and 24 February OS (4–6 March NS) a delegation of the Senate discussed the steps to be taken against Regius with the *curatores*, and they decided, among other things, to discontinue Regius' public course on *Problemata*. It is not known when Regius was informed of this decision, but he must have known it by 5/15 March. If the letter were written on 5 March OS, it is very unlikely that Regius (and Baillet) had not mentioned it.

*Context**The Senate's and the Vroedschap's reaction to the Responsio*

On 18/28 February, two days after the publication of the *Responsio*, the entire academic senate except for Regius gathered to discuss the affair. They drew up a statement, in which they urged the Vroedschap to seize all copies of Regius' work, to prohibit any teaching other than traditional philosophy, to consider how one could put an end to

⁷ See my commentary.

Regius' philosophical course on *Problemata*, and finally which reply would befit the *Responsio*. A delegation of three professors, Dematius, Matthaëus and Lyraeus, was sent to the *curatores* to hand over the statement.⁸ The Burgomasters then seized all copies that had not yet been sold.⁹ The next day, the professors reported back to the Senate, relating that the *curatores* would like to know how the Senate wished to reply to Regius' pamphlet. The Senate decided that their delegates, together with Cyprianus Regneri, should formulate a judgement on the work and the New Philosophy that was to be shown to the Vroedschap, and published after their approbation.¹⁰ On Monday 21 February/3 March, the Senate approved the contents of the document. Cyprianus Regneri, however, asked to be relieved from the task of bringing the judgement before the Vroedschap, which was granted.¹¹ Addressing the Vroedschap, the delegates said that the prosperity and the reputation of the university was at stake, and that their judgement aimed at limiting the consequences of the affair. The Vroedschap ordered the *curatores* to discuss the matter with the delegates.¹² The following day, the *curatores* informed the Vroedschap that nothing definitive had been decided, but that they intended to terminate Regius' lectures on *Problemata*.¹³ The *Acta* of the Senate of 24 February/6 March record the further deliberations between *curatores* and delegates. The *curatores* asked the delegates the following: 1. Would it not be necessary to give Regius another course instead of his lectures on *Problemata*? 2. How was Regius henceforth to conduct his teachings in medicine? 3. Would it be possible that some expressions in the judgement were softened? To which the professors answered negatively, saying that Regius should confine himself to medical courses in traditional medicine. To the last point they replied that some words might be changed, but that the condemnation of Regius' way of philosophising would be maintained.¹⁴ According to NH, the *curatores* took the matter up with Regius personally, and informed him that he would not be allowed to continue either his public courses on physical problems or his philosophical disputations.¹⁵

Finally, on 15/25 March, the Vroedschap passed a resolution which forced Regius to give up any public courses or private lectures other than medical, and they authorised the Senate to publish their judgement on the *Responsio*, in the mildest terms possible so as not to harm the author's reputation.¹⁶ Two days later, the Senate prepared the final text of their judgement, describing it as a decree to remain faithful to ancient philosophy.¹⁷ According to Regius, Æmilius and Cyprianus Regneri refused to subscribe, which may

8 *Acta*, 149–150. The statement is found in NH, 54–57 (on pp. 58–62 a Latin translation from the original Dutch statement)/*Querelle*, 118–119.

9 *Resolutiën*, 158. NH reports that the majority had already been sold or sent to other towns (NH, 53/*Querelle*, 117).

10 *Acta*, 150.

11 *Acta*, 150.

12 NH, 54/*Querelle*, 117–118; *Resolutiën*, 157–158. According to Adam and Tannery, the date 21 February in NH is inexact and should be 24 February; however, the minutes of the Vroedschap confirm NH: the Senate's delegates addressed the Vroedschap on 21 February/3 March, not on 24 February/6 March.

13 *Resolutiën*, 158 (22 February/4 March 1642)

14 *Acta*, 151.

15 NH, 62/*Querelle*, 120.

16 *Resolutiën*, 159.

17 *Acta*, 160 (17/27 March 1642).

[23 February/] 5 March 1642

R/D 37

explain why the judgement is published in NH without any signature (cf. R/D 41). NH relates that the judgement — an official condemnation of Cartesian philosophy — was read and then approved of by the Vroedschap on 24 March/4 April, after which it was immediately printed.¹⁸

¹⁸ NH, 64 ('24 Februarii' in NH is an evident mistake for 24 March)/*Querelle*, 121. The *Judicium Senatus Academici Inclutae Academiae Ultrajectinae de Libello non ita pridem Ultrajecti edito, titulo Responsionis [...]*, is dated 17/27 March 1642; it is reprinted in NH, 65–67/*Querelle*, 121–122, and in Descartes' *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, AT VII 590–593 (with the mistaken date 16 [/26] March); also in AT III 551–553.

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[between 5 and 10 March 1642]

CLE, I, 420–424 (no. 93).
AT, III, 536–542 (no. 272).
AM, V, 158–168; RL, 106–115; B, 199–205.

Vir Clarissime,

Gratulor tibi, quod persecutionem patiaris propter veritatem;¹ gratulor, inquam, et ex animo: non enim video tibi quicquam mali ex istis turbis posse contingere, sed contra gloriae tuae multum accedet. Laetari debes
5 quod Deus inimicis tuis consilium ac bonam mentem ademerit; vides enim iam prohibitione libri tui nihil aliud effectum esse, nisi tantum ut cupidius ematur, accuratius examinetur, eius² iniquitas et causae tuae bonitas à pluribus agnoscatur.³ Plures iam advertent quam acerbè, quam iniuriosè, ac quam sine causâ, solâ invidentiâ suâ permotus, te
10 ille prior lacessiverit; et contra tu quam modestè, quam leniter, quam etiam (quod sanè indignissimum est) reverenter responderis, et quam iustae ac graves causae te ad respondendum coëgerint. Plures agnoscent quam infirmae sint rationes omnes quibus tuas opiniones impugnare conatus est, et contra quam validae sint eae quibus ipsum refutas. Plures
15 concludent nullas amplius ei superesse ad tibi respondendum. Atque omnino plures indignabuntur, quod tantum possit contra ius et fas in vestra civitate, ut ei licuerit publico scripto te Atheum, Bestiam, et aliis eiusmodi nominibus vocare,⁴ falsasque adhibere rationes ad falsis te criminibus onerandum; tibi vero nequidem liceat | verissimis uti 421
20 rationibus, verbisque modestissimis ad te purgandum.

Egregium vero est quod audio ab ipso proponi, ut nempe verbis [537] sibi liceat in te disputare apud delegatos, qui iudicent uter superior sit futurus;⁵ haud dubiè quia eius rationes, dum adhuc calent, ut quaedam

21 Egregium ... in CLE, D/R 38 is not divided into paragraphs

1 Cf. Matthew 5,10: 'Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum' (Vulgate).

2 Sc. Voetius.

3 Cf. R/D 37, ll. 13–17.

4 Cf. D/R 33, ll. 87–88.

5 This is indeed what Voetius proposed during the assembly of the professors on 18/28 February or 19 February/1 March (NH, 54/*Querelle*, 117).

iuscula, sunt sorbendae, et cum frigescent, corrumpuntur. Hac in re, ut
 25 et in aliis multis, est St(ampioenio) nostro simillimus; et sanè non iudico
 tibi quicquam à tali adversario esse metuendum. Quid enim deinceps
 moliri potest? Fortè ut tibi prohibeatur à Magistratu, ne amplius do-
 ceas ea quae soles docere?⁶ Fortè etiam ut tanquam falsa et haeretica
 condemnentur? Fortè denique quod extremum est, ut tu ipsemet tuo
 30 docendi munere priveris? Sed nec puto Consules⁷ vestros tam illi fore
 obsequentes, ut quicquid ei placuerit decernant. Quinimo neminem ex
 iis esse existimo, cui non facile suboleat, quam ob causam tum à Voëtio,
 tum ab aliis plerisque ex tuis collegis, philosophia tua tam acriter imp-
 pugnetur: nempe quia verior est quam vellent, rationesque habet tam
 35 manifestas, ut erroneas ipsorum opiniones etiam non impugnando ever-
 tat, et ridiculas esse ostendat. Nam sanè illi vitio vertere non possunt,
 quod sit nova, quoniam illi etiam Philosophi quotidie novas excogi-
 tant opiniones, et inde maximè gloriam quaerunt, nullusque unquam
 hoc prohibuit; sed nempe illas sibi mutuo non invident, quia veras non
 40 putant; neque etiam tibi tuas inviderent, si falsas esse arbitrarentur. At
 certè Magistratus, qui hactenus non prohibuerunt ne docerent novas
 et falsas, non vetabunt etiam ne doceas novas et veras. Et quamvis
 fortè nonnulli, qui tricas istas sc(h)olarum, utpote ad benè regendam
 Rempublicam minimè utiles, nunquam didicerunt, aequitatem causae
 45 tuae non videant, confido tamen ipsos tam aequos et prudentes fore, ut [538]
 non magis testimonio tuorum adversariorum sint credituri, quam tuo;
 et vel unicum D. V(an der Hoolck), qui veritatem totius controversiae
 proculdubio rectè intelligit, satis authoritatis apud collegas suos esse
 habiturum, ut te ab omni iniuriâ deffendat. Sed, etiamsi aliter contin-
 50 geret, | ac vel professio, quod esset mirabiliter absurdum ac sine ullo 422
 exemplo, tibi auferretur, non tamen ideo tibi vel minimum dolendum
 esse arbitrarer, nec ullum in te dedecus, sed immortale in alios redun-
 daret. Atque tunc profectò, vel crassa ignorantia, vel veritatis odium,
 vel ridenda in vestra civitate potentia toti mundo innotesceret. Quin
 55 etiam profectò, si tuo essem loco, vellem scire à Consulibus, quot ego

26 metuendum CLE (1657)] mutuendum CLE (1663)

6 Descartes aims at Regius' philosophical course on *Problemata*.

7 Frederik Ruysch and Van der Hoolck (cf. D/R 28, n. 12). On the relation between the university and the city government, see my introductory note on Utrecht University

haberem Dominos, et me potius sponte munere meo abdicare, quam Voëtio servire. Nec dubito quin brevi, si velles, perfacilè alibi professionem et magis honorificam et magis utilem esses habiturus; citiusque mille alij à vestris invenirentur, qui eadem qua tui adversarij docerent, 60 quam unus qui eadem quae tu; et tamen fortè ille unus magis à studiosis desideraretur.⁸

Quantum ad me, credidi hactenus me beneficio affectum esse à Dominis tuis, quod, cum scirent te à meis in Philosophia opinionibus non esse alienum, non ideo minùs libenter te in professorem elegerunt; 65 ac fortè etiam, ut mihi persuadere voluisti,⁹ ob hanc praecipuè causam elegerunt. Hoc me peculiariter illis devinxit; atque ideo valdè exopto, ut iactari possit apud posteros, vestram civitatem omnium primam fuisse, in qua Philosophia nostra publicè fuerit recepta, quod spero ipsi dedecori non futurum, ut è contrario non esset laudi, si te nunc tutum 70 ab adversariorum iniuriis non praestaret.¹⁰ Debuit enim sciri ab iis qui te primum in professorem receperunt, fieri non posse ut ea nova quae habebas, aliquid eximij continerent, quin statim plures eorum ex tuis collegis, qui satis ingenij non haberent ad eadem amplectenda, magnam invidiam in te conflarent; atque ideò parati esse debuerunt ad te contra 75 hos protegendum.

Nec sanè ipsis erit difficile; nam quid in te, vel per calumniam, obiici potest? te scilicet nova docere?¹¹ Quasi vero in Philosophia hoc non sit tritum, ut quicumque non planè ingenio sunt destituti novas excogitent opiniones, atque inde maximè gloriam quaerant; sed nempe 80 illas sibi mutuo non invident, quia veras non putant; ut neque etiam tibi tuas inviderent, si falsas esse arbitrarentur. An vero aequum esset, cum eae aliorum permittantur opiniones, quae novae sunt et falsae, ut 423

8 Several elements in this paragraph reappear below, from l. 76 onwards. See my commentary on the text.

9 Cf. R/D 1, ll. 1–20.

10 One is reminded of Descartes' advice to a father on the choice of a university for his son: 'ie croy qu'il seroit beaucoup mieux à Utrecht; car c'est une Université qui, n'estant erigée que depuis quatre ou cinq ans, n'a pas encore eu le temps de se corrompre', Descartes to ***, 11 October 1638, AT II 379.

11 In ll. 76–127 Descartes counters three grievances laid down by the Senate in their communiqué to the Burgomasters, issued on 18/28 February 1642. The first one reads: 'In dese uwe Ed(ele) A(chtbare) Academie is over eenighen tijt herwaerts van een van onse Collegen [Regius] geleert ende gedefendeert geworden sekere soorte van Philosophie, ten meesten deele omstootende de fundamenten van de Philosophie, welcke in alle Academien der gantscher werelt ontfangen ende geapprobeert is, ende oock by onwetende soude moghen misbruyckt werden tot nadeel van de Theologie ende andere Faculteyten', NH, 54/*Querelle*, 118.

tuae prohiberentur, quia novae sunt et verae?¹²

Magnum aliud crimen obiicitur, quod in Voëtium scripseris.¹³ Quasi
 85 vero sit aliquis sanae mentis, qui legendo utriusque libellum,¹⁴ ac moni-
 tus eorum quae priùs ab illo facta fuerunt, non clarè videat illum ipsum
 fuisse qui acerbissimè in te scripsit, calumniisque evertere conatus est;
 te vero tantum nimis humaniter ac nimis moderatè respondisse, eodem
 modo ac si, cum quis te ad occidendum stricto ense fuisset persecutus,
 90 tu vero manu ictum à corpore avertisses, nihilque praeterea egisses, nisi
 quod verbis quam humanissimis eius iram mollire conatus fuisses, ille [540]
 furore ardens accusaret te, quod te à se occidi non permisisses.

At fortè Voëtius ipse te non accusat, sed alij collegae? tanquam
 si obscurum esset illos eius voluntate id facere, eâdemque in te invidiâ
 95 flagrare; ac tanquam si ideo iusta esset accusatio, quod impetum in
 te facientem repuleris, nec ille potius ut aggressor et calumniator sit
 puniendus. Calumniatorem ob id praecipuè appello, quod sciam ipsum
 te iniquissimè accusare voluisse, quod aliquas opiniones, Theologiae
 vestrae contrarias, docuisses, cum tamen omnes tuae melius quam vul-
 100 gares cum Theologiâ consentiant, et facile esset, vel ex solis eius the-
 sibus de Atheismo,¹⁵ quas vidi, per certas et evidentes consequentias
 ostendere, illum potius esse quod de nobis falsò voluit credi.¹⁶ Quin, et
 si esset operae pretium ipsum qualis est describere, artesque omnes eius
 detegere, talis fortè appareret, ut civitati vestrae foret indecorum, ipsum
 105 diutiùs in concionatorem aut professionem retinere; magna enim est vis
 veritatis.

Ultimum et praecipuum quod obiicitur est Academiae vestrae detri-
 mentum, quod ex professorum inimicitiis, ut inquirunt, oriatur.¹⁷ At

100 solis CLE (1657)] soleis CLE (1663)

12 Cf. ll. 36–42 above.

13 'Hier op is gevolcht dat onse Collega [Regius] voorstaender van de vreemde Philosophie een Boeck(j)en heeft laeten drucken, in welcke hy die corollaria met uytdruckinge van den naeme des Auteurs [Voëtius] weder spreekt. Ende dat in sulcker voegen dat hy die ghene, welcke de Philosophie van alle Academien aengenomen voorstaen, ofte de syne niet toe-en-staen, niet nae behooren en (be)handelt', NH, 55/*Querelle*, 118.

14 Voëtius' *Appendix ad corollaria theologicaphilosophica* and Regius' *Responsio*.

15 VOETIUS 1639. Cf. my commentary on *ÆM/D* 5, 19.

16 Examples are found in D/R 33, ll. 27–35, 77–88.

17 'Wanneer wy tot kennisse ghecommen zijn van het Boeck voorsz., soo hebben wy ons daer over seer onstelt, als nae alle apparentie sullende strecken tot groot nadeel van onse Academie, welcke swack ende teer, ende in haren eersten op-ganck is. [1] Want door sulcken maniere van doen is te verwachten dat de liefde ende eendracht onder de Professores verbroken sal worden. [...] 4. Dat onse Academie by de

primò, non video quid privatae istae inimicitiae Universitati nocere
 110 possint; nam econtra hoc efficiet, ut singuli, reprehensionem aliorum
 metuentes, tanto diligentius officio suo fungantur. Ac dein- | de, si vel 424
 maximè hoc noceret, certè alij potius, qui sunt inimiciarum authores,
 quam tu, qui illas fugis, eo nomine essent deponendi. Nec dicent, [541]
 opinor, tua dogmata talia esse ut studiosos avertant ab Academiâ vestrà
 115 frequentandâ; nam audio te et satis multos auditores, et maximè in-
 signes habere; eaque videtur esse fortuna nostrarum opinionum, non
 solùm apud vos, sed et aliis omnibus in locis, ut à praestantioribus
 ingeniis amentur et aestimentur, nec nisi à vilioribus ludi magistris,
 qui sciunt se falsis artibus ad aliquam eruditionis famam pervenisse,
 120 ideoque timent ne, cognitâ veritate, illam amittant, odio haberi. Et nisi
 me augurium fallit, spero fore, ut aliquando propter te unum plures
 Academiam vestram sint adituri, quam propter omnes eos qui tibi ad-
 versantur; nec fortè ad hoc nocebit editio Philosophiae quam paro;¹⁸
 adeò ut, si Domini vestrae Civitatis ad utilitatem et decus Academiae
 125 suae respiciant, omnes potius tuos inimicos quam te unum eiicient; nam
 etiam faciliùs mille alios invenient, qui eadem doceant quae illi, quam
 unum qui eadem quae tu.¹⁹

Nec vereor ne fortè aliqui ex vestris Consulibus, non imbuti sc(h)o-
 lasticis studiis, utpote ad rectè regendam Rempublicam non necessariis,
 130 magis credant adversariis tuis quam tibi. Neque enim illos puto tam
 obesae naris, ut horum invidiam non advertant; et vel unicus D. V(an der
 Hoolck),²⁰ qui statum totius controversiae atque aequitatem tuae causae
 proculdubio rectè perspexit, estque rerum istarum planè intelligens,
 satis auctoritatis apud collegas suos est habiturus, ut te ab omni iniuria
 135 deffendat;²¹ tantamque in eo esse scio integritatem ac prudentiam, ut [542]
 non verear ne magis faveat adversariis tuis quam veritati.

Ac denique ob hoc praecipuè debes laetari, quod tua causa sit talis
 ut, postquam iudicata fuerit à tuis, iudicari etiam debeat ab incolis totius
 orbis terrarum, et cum in ea de honore tantum agatur, si quid tibi priores
 140 contra ius ademerint, cum foenore ab aliis restituatur. Vale.

nabuyrige Academien ende Scholen, ende voorts by alle onse Provincien in verachtige sal comen; soo den toe-loop van studenten nae appaentie sal comen te verminderen', NH, 55/*Querelle*, 119.

18 Descartes' *Principia philosophiae*, published in 1644.

19 Cf. ll. 58–60 above.

20 CLE: D.V.R. Cleselier probably misread D.V.H. Cf. l. 47, and D/R 39, l. 13.

21 Cf. ll. 42–49 above.

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter is the reply to R/D 37, in which Regius informed Descartes of the Senate's deliberations on 18 and 19 February OS and the subsequent seizure of the *Responsio*.²² Descartes is well informed about the Senate's meetings and their grievances in the communiqué to the Burgomasters which led to the confiscation of the *Responsio*.²³ But he does not mention any further repercussions, on the contrary, in the present letter Descartes assures Regius that Van der Hoolck will protect him against any injustice and will prevent a ban on the New Philosophy (ll. 26–28, 40–42, 47–49). This indicates that the letter predates D/R 39, in which Descartes knows that the *curatores* and the Senate had forced Regius to abandon his course on *Problemata* (cf. D/R 39, ll. 8–9). Being the reply to R/D 37, and written before D/R 39, the date of the letter is between 5 and c. 10 March 1642.

Text

Three elements in the second paragraph reappear, in some cases almost verbatim, elsewhere in the text (cf. notes 12, 19 and 21), which renders it impossible that the text as published by Clerselier is identical to the letter as it was sent. At a certain moment, Descartes changed his approach, and decided to deal with the Senate's main grievances in an orderly manner (from l. 76 onwards). It is impossible to reconstruct the letter actually sent, but I conjecture that when Descartes copied the draft, he simply omitted the second paragraph. His repeated appeal to public opinion in the first paragraph (*Plures...*, ll. 8, 12, 14 and 16) contrasts elegantly with *Quantum ad me* (l. 62).

Context

The rhetoric displayed in the letter separates it from Descartes' other letters to Regius, and the appeal of the letter to the Utrecht dignitaries to withstand Voetius' machinations, suggests that it is meant to be read by more people besides Regius. Indeed, Descartes' next letter mentions a previous letter which Regius showed to Van der Hoolck and which he intended to present to others as well: 'I am glad that Van der Hoolck did not want you to show the letter I recently sent you to others' (D/R 39, ll. 15–19). Descartes continues: 'For although I could give Voetius what I promised him there, I hope it will not be necessary: too many things already divert me from my Philosophy, which I nevertheless hope to finish this year'. The 'promise' he made to Voetius probably refers to ll. 102–106 in the present letter, in which Descartes states that it would be useful to reveal the true

²² See my commentary on R/D 37.

²³ Descartes refers to a peculiar proposal by Voetius during one of the meetings in ll. 21–23. In their statement, formulated and communicated to the Burgomasters on 18/28 February, the Senate points out that 1. the New Philosophy Regius propagates is opposed to the philosophy embraced by all and taught at every academy; 2. the *Responsio* is an offence to Voetius and in general to all who disagree with Regius; 3. the pamphlet is a cause of internal differences between the professors, which will be harmful to the Academy's reputation and diminish the influx of students (NH, 54–55, 58–61/*Querelle*, 118–119). All these points are dealt with by Descartes in the present letter (cf. ll. 76–83, 84–106, 107–127).

character of Voetius to the public. Descartes is relieved that Van der Hoolck objects to showing the letter around: people might spread the word that Descartes himself would go after Voetius. Indeed, Descartes fears that an attack on Voetius will divert him too much from his own project, the *Principia* or ‘Philosophy’ as he calls it, which he hopes to finish as soon as possible (l. 123; D/R 39, ll. 18–19). The official condemnation of Cartesian philosophy in Utrecht, however, did trigger a response by Descartes in his *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (cf. R/D 44D, n 4), and the following year he fulfilled his promise with the massive *Epistola ad Voetium*.²⁴

²⁴ Descartes’ confidence in the prevalence of truth (ll. 105–106) would, however, be tasked severely, as he was accused of libel himself (see my commentary to R/D 49, *Context 1*).

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[between 10 and 25 March 1642]

CLE, I, 419–420 (no. 92).
AT, III, 528–529 (no. 270).
AM, V, 153–155; RL, 102–104; CSMK, 210 (partly); B, 189–190.

Vir Clarissime,

Quantùm audio ab amicis, nemo legit responsionem tuam¹ in Voëtium, qui non eam valdè laudet; legerunt autem quamplurimi; nemo qui Voëtium non irrideat, et dicat ipsum de causâ suâ desperasse, quandoquidem ope vestri Magistratus indiguit ad ipsam defendendam. Formas autem substantiales omnes explodunt, et palam dicunt, si reliqua omnis nostra Philosophia ita esset explicata, neminem non eam amplexurum. Dolere non debes quod tibi Physicorum problematum explicatio [529] interdixit sit; quin et vellem etiam ut privata institutio interdixit fuisset: talia enim omnia in honorem tuum cedent, et in dedecus adversariorum.² Ego certè, si tuorum Consulium loco essem, et Voëtium vellem evertere, non aliter tecum agerem eius causa, quam faciunt; et quis scit quid in animo habent? Certe non dubito quin Dominus V(an der) H(oolck) tibi faveat, debesque accuratè eius consiliis mandatisque obtemperare. Gaudeo quod noluerit, ut litteras quas ad te nuper scripseram, cuiquam ostenderes; etsi enim à me ipso impetrassem, antequam mitterem, ut ea, si opus esset, praestarem, quae Voëtio per ipsas promittebam, longè tamen malo ut ne sit opus;³ nimis multa me quotidie avocant à Philosophia mea, quam tamen hoc anno absolvere decrevi.⁴ Caeterum obsequere accuratè ac laeto animo iis omnibus, quae tibi à Dominis tuis praescribentur, ut certus ea tibi dedecori nulli esse posse. Disputationes autem quae in te fient | contemne, ac dicas tantum, si quid in illis boni

420

21 nulli AT] nullo CLE

1 Regius' response to Voetius (REGIUS 1642).

2 On 22 February/4 March the *curatores* and the Senate decided to terminate Regius' lectures on *Problemata* (*Resolutiën*, 158; cf. my commentary on R/D 37). On 15/25 March the Vroedschap formally approved, forcing Regius to abandon any public courses or private lectures other than medical (*Resolutiën*, 159). The present letter clearly predates the resolution by the Vroedschap.

3 The letter in question is probably D/R 38 (see my commentary on D/R 38). According to Dibon, Descartes refers to D/R 35, which is, in my view, very unlikely: D/R 35 is obviously a personal note to Regius and it could hardly impress Van der Hoolck or anyone else (DIBON 1985, 188–189/DIBON 1990, 576–577).

4 Cf. D/R 38, I. 123.

afferant, ipsos etiam posse illud idem scriptis mandare, te vero non posse nisi editis scriptis respondere.⁵ Vale.

COMMENTARY

Date

In the present letter Descartes discusses the prohibition of Regius' course on *Problemata*, commenting that he would prefer him to have been forbidden even to give private lectures in philosophy (ll. 8–9).⁶ The letter consequently postdates D/R 38, in which the philosopher still expects that Van der Hoolck could prevent a ban on the New Philosophy (cf. D/R 38, ll. 26–28, 40–42, 47–49), but it is written before Descartes learned of the Vroedschap's resolution taken on 15/25 March which also denied Regius the right to give private lectures in anything but medicine. This fixes the date of the letter between c. 10 and c. 25 March 1642.

The traditional place of the letter in the correspondence is erroneous. Adam and Tannery date the letter 'late February', placing it immediately after R/D 36 (17/27 February), and before R/D 37 and D/R 38. They rightly point out that Descartes reacts to the Senate's decision to discontinue Regius' course on *Problemata*, but they fail to realise that the date of the Senate's record is 24 February OS, i.e. 6 March NS. The fact that the decision is not mentioned at all in both R/D 37 and D/R 38 seems to have escaped them.

⁵ Cf. R/D 41B, ll. 25–27.

⁶ Regius' letter, to which the present letter is a reply, is not extant. It is not known when exactly Regius was informed of the decision of the *curatores*, but according to NH, the *curatores* had a meeting with the medical professor shortly after discussing with the Senate the proper reaction to the *Responsio* on 4 and 6 March NS (NH, 62/*Querelle*, 120).

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[between 25 and 31 March 1642]

CLE, I, 418 (no. 91).
AT, III, 486 (no. 264).
AM, V, 107–108; RL, 70; B, 140–141.

Vir Clarissime,

Hic te ab aliquot diebus expectavi; iam autem aliquid audio quod, etsi non videatur esse ullius momenti, vereor tamen ne fortè tuum iter tardaverit; et ego econtrà tantò magis tecum loqui exopto, ut quid super
5 hac re agendum sit, communibus consiliis videamus. Nempè audio tuos adversarios tandem vicisse, atque effecisse, ut tibi interdiceretur, ne nostra amplius doceres.¹ Quo animo istud feras, nescio; sed, si mihi credis, planè irridebis et contemnes, tamque apertam invidiam tibi magis gloriosam esse existimabis, quam imperitorum applausus. Neque pro-
10 fectò mirandum est, quod in re, in qua vocum pluralitas locum habet, tu solus, cum veritate paucisque fautoribus, adversariorum multitudini resistere non potueris. Si hoc solo risu et silentio ulcisci velis, atque otium sequi, non dehortabor; sin minùs, quantum in me erit, tibi non deero. Interim rogo ut, vel voce vel litteris, tui me instituti quamprimùm
15 facias certiozem. Vale et me ama.

Si huc venias, rogo ut quamplurimas ex adversarij tui thesibus tecum afferas.² Vale.

COMMENTARY

Date

With some hesitation, Adam and Tannery place the letter in January 1642. First, because in December 1641 Descartes invited Regius to Endegeest (cf. l. 16; D/R 29, ll. 47–48); second, because the disputations referred to (l. 16) may concern Voetius' disputations against Regius of December 1641, and finally, the letter contains an expression which is

16 Si ... *no new paragraph in CLE*

1 The reference is probably to the Vroedschap's resolution of 15/25 March. See my commentary.

2 Cf. R/D 41B, ll. 25–26.

also found in a letter of 19 January 1642 (ll. 9–12).³ However, Adam and Tannery rightly point out that in January 1642 no measures were taken against Regius. Therefore, if the letter dates from January 1642, Descartes was misled by his anonymous source.

Misinformed as Descartes may have been, it makes little sense to write ‘audio tuos adversarios *tandem* vicisse’ in January 1642. Moreover, the fact that the consequence, namely *tibi interdiceretur, ne nostra amplius docetur* (ll. 6–7), does not come as a surprise to Descartes, indicates that he had been prepared for this to happen. This renders it plausible that the letter was in any case written after R/D 37 (5 March [NS]), in which Regius relates the Senate’s attempt to ban the New Philosophy.

I conjecture that the rumour that reached Descartes was true: it refers to the Vroedschap’s formal decision on 15/25 March that henceforth Regius was to teach medicine alone, in his public as well as in his private lectures.⁴ The news being brought to Descartes before Regius put pen to paper, he writes to his friend in order to inquire after the truth of the rumour, and his state of mind after the setback. R/D 41 ([21/] 31 March) appears to be the reply to Descartes’ inquiries.⁵ If this is the case, the letter can be dated between 25 and 31 March 1642.

³ Descartes to Gibieuf, AT III 473,14–17.

⁴ *Resolutiën*, 159.

⁵ As noticed by Duker as well (DUKER 1861, 109). See especially R/D 41B, ll. 23–29.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

[21/] 31 March 1642

Vie, II, 30 [A], 155–156 [B] (no. 19).
AT, III, 557–558 (no. 276).

[A]

C'était [Voetius] un esprit bourru et volage selon M. de Sorbière, qui était de sa communion lors qu'il le reconnut tel; [*i.m.*: Lettr. et Rel. in IV^o pag. 687.¹] si étourdi et si indiscret, qu'il ne faisait point difficulté de médire et de calomnier grossièrement dans ses sermons. [*i.m.*: Regij Epist. MS. 19 ad Cart.] Ce qui
5 obligea un jour le Ministre M. Heydanus de le faire descendre de chaire, et de l'interdire pour cette raison.²

[B]

[...] Voetius triomphant de cet arrêt³ convoqua son assemblée dès le XVII du même mois; et y fit porter, contre toute forme de justice, un jugement qui paraissait rendu au nom de toute l'Université,⁴ [*i.m.*: Ibid.⁵ et Narr. pag. 67.⁶] mais qu'il avait minuté seul et prononcé comme Recteur, [*i.m.*: Son rectorat finissait alors.⁷] étant
5 tout à la fois le juge et la partie de M. Regius, qui ne fut ni appelé ni entendu dans ses défenses. Irrégularité, dont le blâme semblait moins tomber sur les Professeurs, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 19 MS. de Reg.] de qui on ne devait exiger autre chose que l'art de bien régenter, que sur les Magistrats, qui avaient érigé des régents

1 'De sorte que rencontrant les pensées de M. Descartes plus à son gout [than other 'new philosophers'], il [Regius] s'en accomoda tout incontinent, fit du bruit, acquist de la reputation, et donna de l'ombrage à son Colleague Gilbert Voëtius professeur en Theologie. Il en fut persecuté par cet esprit bourru, et pendant cette persecution M. Descartes departit liberalement à son disciple les louanges qu'il luy a voulu oster depuis pour un suiet assés frivole; Car il disoit alors, qu'il ne cognoissoit que deux personnes qui penetrassent dans ses sentiments, un homme et une fille, dont le premier estoit ce Regius, et l'autre madame Elizabeth l'aisnée des Princesses Palatines', Sorbière to Pierre Petit (1594/98–1677), 20 February [1658], in SORBIÈRE 1660A, 687 (the year '1657' in SORBIÈRE 1660A is probably a mistake for 1658, as the letter refers to a letter by Petit of 20 November 1657). On Sorbière and Regius see my commentary.

2 There is no independent evidence of the incident, and its actual context is far from clear. On Heydanus, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

3 On 15/25 March 1642, the Utrecht Vroedschap passed a resolution which forced Regius to give up any public courses or private lectures other than medical, authorising the Academic Senate to publish their judgement on the *Responsio (Resolutiën, 159)*.

4 *Judicium Senatus Academici Inclutae Academiae Ultrajectinae*, cf. my commentary on R/D 37, *Context*.

5 The preceding reference is 'Epist. Cartes. ad celeb. Voet. pag. 266, 267' (AT VIII B 185–186), which is a misprint for *Epistola ad Voetium*, 36–37 (AT VIII B 33–34).

6 *Querelle*, 122–123. The only information Baillet borrows from NH, 62, is the date the judgement was issued.

7 On 16/26 March Matthaëus succeeded Voetius as rector.

en juges sans leur donner en même temps la suffisance et l'intégrité nécessaire
 10 pour juger. Il n'y eut que huit Professeurs qui eurent part à ce jugement. [*I.m.*:
 Lettr. 36 MS. de Reg. à Desc.⁸] Savoir G. Voetius, Ch. Dematius, M. Schotanus,
 A. Mathaeus, G. Stratenus, J. Liraeus, Arn. Senguerdius, et Dan. Berckringer, qui
 prononcèrent contre la réponse de M. Regius à Voetius et contre la philosophie
 nouvelle. Les autres furent honteux de suivre la passion de Voetius, mais ils étaient
 15 les plus faibles.⁹ Il n'y eut que M. Emilius qui forma opposition à ce jugement,
 et M. Cyprien, [*i.m.*: Cyprianus Regneri, qui ne connaissait point M. Descartes et
 n'était point ami particulier de Regius.] Professeur en droit, qui protesta de nullité,
 voyant que l'on n'alléguait aucune raison recevable pour rendre ce jugement valide.
 Il voulut même qu'il fût fait mention de son opposition dans l'acte du jugement, et
 20 qu'on le nommât pour n'être point confondu mal à propos avec les auteurs d'une
 action si peu raisonnable sous le nom général des Professeurs de l'Université.¹⁰
 [*I.m.*: Narrat. histor.]

M. Regius manda toutes ces procédures à M. Descartes le XXXI de Mars 1642,
 [*i.m.*: Lett. 19 MS. de Reg.] et lui envoya le décret du Magistrat du xv du même
 25 mois, le jugement de ces Professeurs dont nous venons de parler, et les thèses
 de Voetius le fils dressées par son père.¹¹ Il lui donna avis en même temps que
 Voetius avait suborné un jeune étudiant pour écrire contre sa réponse,¹² mais que
 les savants et les honnêtes gens, tant d'Utrecht | que des autres villes de Hollande, 156
 commençaient à se déclarer contre la conduite de Voetius.

8 R/D 48A.

9 In fact, all professors, except Æmilius and Regneri, agreed with Voetius. The two associate professors, Ravensberger and Paulus Voet, were no members of the Senate.

10 Baillet refers to NH, but nothing to this extent is found there. His source must be R/D 41. That the letter mentioned the opposition of Regneri and Æmilius is confirmed by Descartes' reply (D/R 42, ll. 4–5). In the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* Descartes also recounts that Regneri demanded that his opposition be expressly stated (AT VII 590). Moreover, in the *Epistola ad Voetium* Descartes relates how Regneri demanded proof of the judgement's accusation that the New Philosophy was false, absurd, and contrary to orthodox theology (AT VIII B 34). Possibly due to Regneri's opposition, the judgement was issued without any subscription at all. The only indication of Regneri's discontentment in the Acta of the Senate is his request, on 21 February OS, to be relieved from the task to inform the Vroedschap of the judgement, which was granted (*Acta*, 150).

11 For the Vroedschap's resolution and the judgement, cf. my commentary on R/D 37, *Context*. The only surviving disputation from this period by Voetius' eldest son Paulus is VOET 1642, defended on 19/29 March, containing a defence of substantial forms.

12 See D/R 42, ll. 9–10.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 31 March 1642, without indication of the calendar used. However, since Descartes' reply was written before 10 April NS (see my commentary on D/R 42), the precise date of the letter is [21/] 31 March 1642.

*Context**Regius and Sorbière*

An interesting source for Baillet on Dutch literary life and science are the letters and descriptions by Samuel Sorbière (1615–1670).¹³ After his arrival in Holland in the spring of 1642, he made a tour of the prominent scholars, visiting Descartes at Endegeest, where he met Picot and Hogelande as well, and Regius in Utrecht. He wrote Mersenne that he had numerous talks with Regius and heard him publicly teach the circulation of the blood.¹⁴ Probably at this time, Regius gave him a copy of his *Physiologia*.¹⁵ He kept in touch with the Utrecht professor — perhaps because of his own medical interests — and informed his foreign correspondents of Regius' publications in 1646 and 1647.¹⁶ In fact, he had no high opinion of the physical theories of either Descartes or Regius, but he stayed on friendly terms with Regius. During his tour through the Dutch academies in 1660, his visit to Utrecht was rather short, but he did visit the three persons worth seeing: Van Schurman, Regius and Voetius:

D'Amsterdam nous fusmes à Utrecht, où nous desirions de voir la celebre Mademoiselle Schurman. Mais comme elle fait quelque façon à se montrer; à cause de l'importunité à laquelle elle seroit exposée, s'il ne tenoit qu'à aller heurter à sa porte; nous ne fismes pas assés de sejour dans cette Ville, pour y prendre le tour qu'il falloit. Cependant Monsieur Regius nous y accueillit avec toute sa courtoisie, nous mena dans son carosse à la promenade, et nous fit voir quelques excellens peintres. Nous ne voulusmes pas partir d'Utrecht sans y avoir une veuë de ce Gilbert [sic] Voëtius Ministre et Professeur en Theologie, qui a tant fait parler de soy en ces Provinces-là par son esprit de contradiction. Il a esté tousiours le contretenant de quelqu'un de ses Collegues, ou de quelque autre scavant homme. Je l'ay veu acharné tantost contre Regius et Descartes, [...] et une infinité d'autres avec qui il a pris plaisir d'entrer en querelle. [...] Cét homme a du scavoir et de la chaleur. Comme il s'est exercé toute sa vie à battre le fer, nous remarquions qu'il se tenoit tousiours sur ses gardes, en posture de parer ou de porter quelque coup. Mais c'est assés parlé de ce gladiateur...¹⁷

13 On Sorbière, see the biographical notice by Malcom in HOBBS 1994, 893–899.

14 'Ultrajecti plures sermones habui cum Henrico Regio medico, quem audivi publice in Academia opinionem Harvaei, etc. [sic]', Sorbière to Mersenne, 25 August 1642, CM XI 241.

15 SORBIÈRE 1691, 210–212, AT IV 240

16 See Sorbière's correspondence with Hobbes and Mersenne, in HOBBS 1994, I, 128, 132, 136, 142 (cf. SCHUHMAN 1997, 130), and in CM XV 68, 95, 125–126, 203. A copy of a letter by Sorbière to Regius from 29 October 1666 is kept in Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms Latin 10.352, f. 399v. Further references to Regius in the same manuscript are found in letters to Andreas Vissonatus, 14 May 1643 (f. 52) and to Abraham Prataeus, 5 April 1647 (f. 108v). I thank Prof. K. Schuhmann for bringing the manuscript to my attention.

17 Sorbière to Guillaume de Bauru, 19 July 1660, in SORBIÈRE 1660B, 181–182, 185; BLOK 1901, 83–85.

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius

[early April 1642]

CLE, I, 425–426 (no. 94).
 AT, III, 558–560 (no. 277).
 AM, V, 186–188; RL, 116–118; B, 211–213.

Vir Clarissime,

Legi et risi tum theses Voëtij pueri, sive infantis, filij volui dicere, tum
 etiam iudicium Academiae vestrae, quae fortè etiam non immeritò in- [559]
 fans dici potest.¹ Laudo Æmilium et Cyprianum quod tot ineptiarum rei
 5 esse noluerint.² In te verò subirascor, quod talia tibi cordi esse videantur;
 laetari enim deberes quammaximè, quod videas adversarios tuos suis se
 propriis armis iugulare. Nam certè nemo mediocriter intelligens scripta
 ista perleget, quin facilè animadvertat adversariis tuis et rationes deesse
 quibus tuas refutent, et prudentiam quâ imperitiam suam tegant. Au-
 10 divi hodie rursus Monachum tui Voëtij responsionem parare;³ et quidem
 certum est, auditum enim à Bibliopolâ qui habet edendam.⁴ Continebit
 circiter decem folia, nempe Ap(p)endix Voëtij cum notis tuis adhuc
 semel ibi edentur. Faveo sic scribentibus, et velim etiam ut gaudeas.
 Quantùm ad decretum tuorum Dominorum, nihil mitius, nihil pruden-
 15 tius mihi videtur ab iis fieri potuisse, ut scilicet se collegarum tuorum
 querelis liberarent.⁵ Tu, si mihi credis, ipsis quam accuratissimè, atque
 etiam ambitiosè, obtemperabis, docebisque tuam Medicinam Hippo-
 craticè et Galenicè, et nihil amplius. Si qui studiosi aliud à te petant,
 excusabis te perhumaniter, quod tibi non liceat; cavebis etiam ne quam
 20 rem particularem explices, et dices, ut res est, ista ita inter se cohaerere
 ut unum sine alio satis intelligi non possit. Dum ita te geres, si quae
 ante- | hâc docuisti digna sint quae discantur, et habeas auditores dig- 426

12 Appendix ExJ] Apendix CLE

1 Cf. R/D 41B, ll. 25–26.

2 Cf. R/D 41B, ll. 15–18.

3 The ‘monk’ is Voetius’ student Lambertus vanden Waterlaet (cf. the *Biographical Lexicon*). On his work against Regius, see my commentary. In the translation of AM the adverb *rursus* is mistakenly taken with *parare*: ‘un Moine prépare de nouveau une réponse’. The adverb clearly belongs to *Audivi hodie*.

4 The Leiden printer Willem Christiaens van der Boxe, active between 1631 and 1658 (GRUYS/DE WOLF 1980, 14). Cf. R/D 16, n. 5.

5 Cf. R/D 41B, n. 3.

nos qui ea discant, non dubito quin brevi denuò vel Ultraiecti vel alibi [560]
 copiam et auctoritatem illa docendi cum honore duplicato sis habiturus.
 25 Interim verò nihil mali mihi videtur tibi contigisse, sed econtrà mul-
 tum boni; omnes enim te multò plus laudant, et pluris faciunt, quam
 fecissent, si adversarij tui tacuissent. Ac praeterea accessit otium, cum
 docendi onere ex parte sis liberatus, nec ideo de stipendio decessit.
 Quid deest, nisi animus, qui modeste haec ferat? Quiesce, quaeso, et
 30 ride, nec vereare ne adversarij tui satis mature non puniantur.⁶ Denique
 vicisti, si tantum siles; si malis redintegrare praelium, fortunae rursus
 te committes. Vale.

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter is in reply to R/D 41 of [21/] 31 March. Descartes confirms that a work against Regius by a certain ‘monk’ is now being printed. The book, Vanden Waterlaet’s *Prodromus*, was ready on 10 April, and the letter consequently dates between 31 March and 10 April 1642.⁷

*Context**Prodromus sive Examen tutelare orthodoxae philosophiae principiorum*

The Voetian reply to Regius’ *Responsio* was not long in coming. On April 10, Lambertus vanden Waterlaet, the respondens of Voetius’ disputations of 18, 23 and 24 December 1641, sent a copy of his freshly printed *Prodromus* to Huygens.⁸ The pamphlet consists of two parts. In the first part, Vanden Waterlaet gives the text of Voetius’ *Appendix* on substantial forms, Regius’ reply, and finally his own response to Regius. The second part offers a closer analysis of several passages in Regius’ *Responsio*. The first part consists of 120 pages (9 quires, marked A–I), the second of 36 pages (3 quires, marked a–c). The use of uppercase and lowercase letters indicates that the second part was printed separately. However, the errata of the second part are listed on p. 120 of the first part, which shows that both parts were assembled in one volume before the work left the printing office. As each part is written in a very different style, the suspicion forces itself that each part was composed separately by a different author. In any case, the indisputable author of the first part, Vanden Waterlaet, was responsible for seeing the whole through the press.⁹

6 Perhaps Descartes alludes to his account of the Utrecht affair in the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (AT VII 582–599).

7 On 10 April Vanden Waterlaet sent a copy to Huygens (HUYGENS 1911–1917, III, 278). The *terminus ante quem* of D/R 42 is indicated by Verbeek (VERBEEK 1999, 101–102).

8 HUYGENS 1911–1917, III, 278. On 7 April 1642 Huygens wrote to Mersenne that the work was being printed (CM XI 100–101). Heereboord reported the same on 8 April (Heereboord to Colvius, AT VIII B 196–197).

9 Cf. Verbeek’s observations on VANDEN WATERLAET 1642, in VERBEEK 1999, 98–101.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

4 April 1642

Vie, II, 157 [A], 175 [B] (no. 20).
AT, III, 562 (no. 278).

[A] = R/D 47A

Pour ce qui est de la réfutation que Voetius avait entreprise contre la réponse de M. Regius à ses thèses par le ministère de ses étudiants, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 25 MS. de Regius.¹] l'on peut dire qu'elle échoua entre les mains d'un moine renégat, ou fugitif, comme l'appelle M. Regius, pour avoir voulu dissimuler qu'il en fût
5 l'auteur. Pour éloigner le public encore davantage de cette pensée, il avait confié l'écrit à ce moine pour l'aller faire imprimer à Leyde, afin qu'il parût que Messieurs Descartes et Regius avaient encore des ennemis ailleurs qu'à Utrecht. [...] ² Mais le Recteur de l'Université de Leyde qui était M. Golius, [*i.m.*: Lettre 20 MS. de Reg.] ayant été averti de ce qui se passait, se transporta incontinent chez l'imprimeur
10 de cette réfutation, et fit faire en sa présence une information de cette entreprise.³ [*i.m.*: Item. lettr. 25 MS.] L'imprimeur la rejeta toute sur le moine, qui se trouva heureusement absent de l'imprimerie, et qui prit la fuite pour aller à Utrecht donner avis à Voetius de ce qui était arrivé à son ouvrage, et lui rendre compte de sa commission.⁴

[B]

La philosophie ancienne, ou, pour mieux parler, la manière ancienne de philosopher, recevait de jour en jour de nouvelles attaques par les nouveaux philosophes. Les deux Boots, médecins de Londres, entre les autres voulurent se signaler par un livre qu'ils firent paraître à Dublin en 1642 [*i.m.*: Ou même dès le mois de
5 Juillet 1641.] contre Aristote. Regius en donna avis à M. Descartes par une lettre du IV d'Avril, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 20 MS. de Reg. à M. Desc.] où il lui témoigna que ce qu'il en avait lu lui avait paru assez bon pour renverser la matière première et détruire les formes substantielles. Le livre était petit, et ne paraissait pas encore suffisant pour saper les principes d'Aristote et des Péripatéticiens. Il avait pour

1 R/D 46.

2 In the passage omitted Baillet paraphrases D/R 42 (ll. 9–13).

3 The refutation in question is VANDEN WATERLAET 1642; see my commentary. Golius was rector of Leiden University from 8 February 1642 till 8 February 1643.

4 See my commentary on text A.

- 10 titre, *Philosophia naturalis reformata, id est Philosophiae Aristotelicae accurata examinatio ac solida confutatio, et novae ac verioris introductio per Gerardum ac Arnoldum Botios fratres Hollandos Medicinae Doctores*.⁵

COMMENTARY

Date

The date of the letter, 4 April 1642, is given by Baillet. There are no means to establish the calendar used.

Text

Text A contains two references to R/D 47 (no. 25 in the Clerselier collection), the second of which cannot be separated from the reference to the present letter. I do not omit the passage connected to the first reference, in order to preserve Baillet's own context.

AT's selection from *Vie* also contains the paragraph immediately prior to my selection, in which Baillet relates the publication of Vanden Waterlaet's *Prodromus*. I do not incorporate the paragraph, because there is no mention of R/D 43.⁶

5 *Philosophia naturalis reformata*, Dublin: Societas Bibliopolorum, 1641. The work offers a minute analysis of the various arguments for and against Aristotle, concluding that the Stagirite's discussion of principles is confused (VERBEEK 1992A, 9–10). The brothers Gerard (1604–1650) and Arnold (1606–1653) Bootius, or Boot(s), received their medical training in Leiden and then settled in the British Isles. Arnold became physician general to the English troops in Ireland, Gerard was appointed physician to the English King. Cf. NNBW, IV, 217; DNB, 5, 283–285; LINDEBOOM 1984, 214–216. In a letter to the Dordrecht minister Andreas Colvius (1594–1671), Adriaan Heereboord (on him see R/D 50, n. 2) shares Regius' opinion: 'Excuditur jam Leidae apud nos responsorium aliquod scriptum, pro formis substantialibus, et D. Voetio, sub Respondentis nomine [VANDEN WATERLAET 1642]. Cui quod respondere non licebit Regius, iniquius ferrem, nisi Bootii fratres jam demoliti essent illas formas substantiales, ut, quid amplius dici queat, vix equidem videam.' (8 April 1642, quoted from AT VIII B 196–197).

6 The paragraph in question contains a marginal reference, 'Ibid. num 32', which belongs to the following passage in the main text: '[...] on grossit le libelle [*sc. Prodromus*] d'une seconde partie, dans l'intention de défendre encore mieux l'honneur de l'Université et des anciennes opinions' (*Vie*, II, 156/AT III 561). Adam and Tannery cannot explain the reference, and they conjecture that it is related to the previous note, which claims that the *Prodromus* is listed in the inventory of Descartes' estate. But Adam and Tannery remark, first, that the *Prodromus* does not figure at all in the so-called 'Stockholm inventory', and second, that this inventory catalogues its entries by letters, not by numbers. However, had Adam and Tannery copied down Baillet's marginal references more carefully, they would undoubtedly have noticed that 'Ibid. num. 32.' refers back to the marginal reference at the top of the paragraph, viz. 'Epist. ad P. Dinet. num. 31' (*Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, AT VII 598–599; Baillet used the 1673 edition of the *Meditationes* (Paris: Bobin and Le Gras), in which edition the text is divided into numbered articles). One cannot blame Baillet for being imprecise, because the marginal notes between the two references to the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* are clearly marked with an asterisk (for a similar case, see R/D 50B). For the 'Stockholm inventory', see my Introduction, § 1.1.1).

*Contents**Text A*

Although Baillet's story in text A appears to be straightforward, the biographer is in fact terribly confused. According to Baillet, one of Voetius' students, a 'renegade monk', went to Leiden to have a refutation of Regius' *Responsio* printed. When the rector of Leiden University, Jacobus Golius, started an investigation, the monk ran off to Utrecht and the project failed. We recognise in this project Vanden Waterlaet's *Prodromus* — with the exception that it actually did appear — but Baillet did not. Two misconceptions prevented him from putting the pieces together. First, he assumes that the 'renegade monk' is Martin Schoock (cf. R/D 49B, ll. 10–11), whereas Lambertus vanden Waterlaet is meant.⁷ What increased Baillet's confusion is the fact that Vanden Waterlaet played an active role in the realization of Schoock's *Admiranda methodus*, which explains why his name pops up in R/D 47 (no. 25 in the Clerselier collection). Baillet's second mistake is his belief that the monk's project failed, and because he knew that the *Prodromus* did appear — he discusses its publication in the paragraph preceding text A — the monk's project and the *Prodromus* could not be the same thing.

Baillet's first misconception, the mistaken identity, can be accounted for, but it is difficult to understand why he believes that Golius prevented the monk from publishing the pamphlet. Did he find this in Regius' letter? If so, the letter would obviously date from 4 April NS, before the *Prodromus* finally did appear. However, Baillet's assumption that the project failed, may very well be his own conclusion, as 'faire une information' (l. 10) means conducting an investigation; it does not say anything of the outcome.⁸

Given Baillet's profound confusion, it is impossible to draw anything conclusive from text A. But his statement that Golius made inquiries is in itself not implausible. According to a decree by the Senate of Leiden University, students were not allowed to publish without the Senate's permission and since Vanden Waterlaet had matriculated in Leiden in February 1642, Golius, being rector, may have started an investigation.⁹

⁷ See the *Biographical Lexicon*.

⁸ In the abridged version of *Vie*, Baillet gives a succinct account the whole affair: '[...] Waterlaet son écolier imprima un libelle sous le titre de *Prodrome*, comme si c'eût été l'avancoureur de celui qu'il préparoit lui-même, mais dont la fortune ne fut pas si heureuse. Car voiant que les gens de bien n'étoient pas fort contens de ses manières à Utrecht, et l'ayant envoyé à Leyde pour l'y faire imprimer sous la direction d'un Moine renegat, le Recteur de cette Université qui étoit Golius le supprima avant qu'il fût entièrement imprimé, et le Moine prit la fuite.' BAILLET 1693, 204/BAILLET 1692 (1946), 196.

⁹ *Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 329.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

1 June 1642

Vie., I, 13 [A]; II, 165 [B]; 177 [C]; 178 [D]; 179 [E]; 170–171 [F] (nos. 21 and 22).
AT, III, 570 [B]; 571 [C]; 572 [D]; 573–574 [E]; 570–571 [F] (no. 281–I).

[A]

Cartesius, selon lui [Descartes], était un nom feint, plus propre à le faire méconnaître des personnes de sa connaissance, et à le faire désavouer de ses parents, qu'à le faire connaître à la postérité. [*I.m.*: Tom. 1 de ses lettr. p. 387, tom. 2 p. 265, item pag. 284.¹] L'événement fit voir qu'il avait encore autre chose à craindre
5 de cette licence de latiniser son nom, [*i.m.*: Senguerdus apud Regium Epist. 22 MS. ad Cart.] puisque quelques-uns de ses ennemis cherchant à lui dire des injures, s'avisèrent de l'appeler *Cartaceus Philosophus*.² [*I.m.*: Philosophe de carte.]

[B]

[...] cette édition,³ qui se trouvant ainsi plus complète que la première, parut plus que suffisante pour payer la patience avec laquelle les Hollandais et les autres étrangers avaient attendu la lecture de l'ouvrage. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 21 et 22 MSS. de Regius.]

[C]

[...] M. Descartes, qui au jugement de plusieurs venait de le [Voetius] couler à fonds dans l'Épître au P. Dinet. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 22 MS. de Reg. à Desc.]

[D]

L'Épître au P. Dinet lui [Voetius] tenait au cœur. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 22 MS. de Regius.]
L'exposition toute simple que M. Descartes y avait donnée de sa conduite, et le petit commentaire qu'il y avait fait au Jugement Académique de l'Université, qui en était devenu tout ridicule, lui avaient dérangé le cerveau.⁴

1 Respectively D/R 13, ll. 38–41; Descartes to Mersenne, 11 November 1640, AT III 235/CM X 228; Descartes to Mersenne, 31 December 1640, AT III 277/CM X 362.

2 Apparently, Regius informed Descartes that the Utrecht professor of philosophy Senguerd made fun of the name *Cartesius*, calling Descartes *Chartaceus philosophus*, a philosopher who exists only on paper.

3 The second edition of the *Meditationes*, printed in Amsterdam by the Elzevier house in 1642.

4 Regius having been silenced by the Senate and Vroedschap alike, Descartes proceeded in a personal capacity. In his *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, appended to the second edition of the *Meditationes* (Amsterdam: L. Elsevier, 1642) Descartes scorns both Voetius and the judgement of the Senate, which he attributes to Voetius alone. The Vroedschap, however, is praised for its decision to appoint Regius professor of medicine, thereby showing that they preferred Cartesianism over the Ancient philosophy (AT VII 582–599).

[E]

M. Regius, nonobstant le conseil que lui avait donné M. Descartes d'exécuter à la rigueur le Décret des Magistrats, par lequel il lui était défendu d'enseigner autre chose qu'Hippocrate et Galien, et les opinions communément reçues dans l'Université,⁵ ne pouvait s'empêcher de proposer les nouveaux sentiments avec
 5 les anciens. Il manda à M. Descartes [*i.m.*: Lett. 22 MS. de Reg.] « qu'il se trouvait obligé d'en user de la sorte, parce qu'il appréhendait de faire désertier la plupart de ses auditeurs, qui ne voulaient pas se contenter des sentiments de Galien, d'Hippocrate et d'Aristote. »⁶

[F]

[...] M. Regius rendait à M. Descartes de fréquentes visites dans Eyndegeest, qu'il regardait comme l'école où il allait puiser les enseignements auxquels le simple commerce des lettres ne pouvait suffisamment fournir. Monsieur Descartes le considérait souvent chez lui moins comme un disciple qui eût besoin d'instruction,
 5 que comme un ami à qui il devait procurer quelque divertissement. Aussi voyons-nous [*i.m.*: Tom. I des lettr. p. 428.⁷] qu'il avait soin de convier avec lui sa femme et sa fille de le venir voir à Eyndegeest. [*I.m.*: V. aussi les lettr. MSS. de Regius.] Il n'était pas difficile à M. Regius de mener souvent sa famille à M. Descartes, qui la regardait avec la même tendresse qu'il aurait fait la | sienne. [...] Il y trouva
 10 M. Picot qui demeurait avec M. Descartes depuis la fin de l'année précédente; [*i.m.*: Lettr. MSS. de Desc. à Picot, et de Regius à Descartes.] et la relation qu'ils eurent ensemble, en se considérant comme disciples d'un même maître et nourris de la même doctrine, forma entre eux une amitié pareille à celle qui les unissait avec M. Descartes.⁸

COMMENTARY

Date

In text B, Baillet refers to two different letters, which have the numbers 21 and 22 in the Clerselier collection. The reference to letter 21 is the sole reference to that particular letter in Baillet's *Vie*. Since it is bracketed together with the reference to letter 22, it is not listed separately in this edition.

⁵ Cf. D/R 42, ll. 16–18.

⁶ Sorbière confirms that Regius did not stick to explaining traditional medicine, see my commentary on R/D 41.

⁷ D/R 45, ll. 64–66.

⁸ Cf. my commentary on D/R 34.

Baillet does not give the date of either letter, but both are in any case posterior to the publication of the Amsterdam edition of Descartes' *Meditationes* (cf. text B), published mid-May 1642.⁹ If letter 21 precedes letter 22, it may have been a short letter to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the *Meditationes*, and in that case would date from the second half of May 1642.

Although Baillet does not mention the date of letter 22, it is possible to determine its precise date, on the basis of text E and two notes in the *ExI*. According to the notes in the *ExI*, D/R 45 is the reply to a letter by Regius of 1 June 1642.¹⁰ Regrettably, the notes do not indicate which letter of the Clerselier collection in particular, but text E supplies sufficient indications that it concerns letter 22. In text E, Baillet relates that Regius did not follow Descartes' advice in D/R 42 (ll. 16–21) to observe his superiors' decree to teach medicine strictly along Hippocratic and Galenic lines. Regius explains — and Baillet now quotes from the letter — that obeying the decree would turn away most of his students, since they refused to confine themselves to the views of Galen, Hippocrates and Aristotle. In D/R 45 (ll. 30–34) Descartes returns to the subject, saying that Regius in his lectures should not mix 'our philosophy' with Galenic and Aristotelian elements, unless he is convinced that the Utrecht magistrates do not object. He adds that having no students at all will not harm his reputation. This, together with Descartes' remark in D/R 45 (ll. 2–4) that he is pleased to hear the Utrecht reaction to his *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, shows that D/R 45 is the reply to letter 22, the date of which is therefore 1 June 1642.

Text

Adam and Tannery take letters 21 to 26 in the Clerselier collection together, indicating the difficulty of listing them separately (AT III 570). The compilation is dated 'Summer 1642', with the reservation that some of the letters may actually date from 1643. Although references to some of the letters are indeed inseparable, it is not necessary to stack them indiscriminately. The fact that several passages in *Vie*, omitted in AT, deal with just one of the letters 21 to 26, makes separation even more desirable.¹¹ Moreover, one of the letters concerned can be dated very precisely (no. 22, or R/D 44). In the present edition, the letters 21 to 26 are therefore listed as follows:

- Nos. 21 and 22: R/D 44 (1 June 1642);
- Nos. 23 and 24: R/D 49 (late July or August 1643);
- No. 25: R/D 46 (Winter 1642–1643);
- No. 26: R/D 47 (before May 1643).

⁹ CRAPULLI 1985, 101.

¹⁰ *ExI*, I, p. 426, *in margine*: 'Celle cy sert de reponse a celle de M^r le Roy du 1^{er} Juin 1642.' The note on an inserted leaflet reads: 'La 95 du 1^{er} Vol. p. 426 est de M. D. a M. Reg. Elle n'est point datée, mais car elle repond a une lettre de Regius datée du 1^{er} Juin, je la date du 8^e Juin 1642.' Because both hands give the same date, the calendar meant is probably the Gregorian calendar (cf. my Introduction, § 2.3.1).

¹¹ Some references in *Vie* to the letters 21–26 are neglected: R/D 44A and R/D 46C, ll. 1–13. Others were initially overlooked by Adam and Tannery, but are found elsewhere in their edition: R/D 46C and R/D 49C.

Descartes [Endegeest] to Regius
[June 1642]

CLE, I, 426–428 (no. 95).
AT, III, 565–568 (no. 280).
AM, V, 200–205; RL, 120–124; CSMK, 213–214 (partly); B, 216–219.

Vir Clarissime,

Gaudeo nostram de Voëtio historiam¹ vestris non displicuisse; neminem
adhuc vidi, ne ex Theologis quidem, qui non illi vapulanti favere videretur.² Nec sanè nimis acris mea narratio dici potest, cùm nihil nisi rem
gestam commemorem, multòque etiam plura scripserim in quendam ex
5 Patribus Societatis Iesu.³

Legi cursim ea quae ad me misisti, nihilque in iis non optimum, et
valde ad rem, notavi, praeter haec pauca.⁴

Primò, stilus multis in locis non est satis emendatus.

10 Praeterea, fol. 46, ubi ais *materiam non esse corpus naturale*,
adderem: *iuxta illos qui corpus naturale definiunt hoc modo etc.*; nam,
quantum ad nos, qui eam veram et completam substantiam esse puta-
mus, non video | cur corpus naturale esse negaremus. 427

Et, folio 66, differentiam inter res vivas et vitae expertes videris [566]
15 maiorem statuere, quam inter horologium aliudve automatum, et cla-
vem, gladium, aliudve instrumentum, quod spontè non movetur: quod
non probo. Sed, ut *sponte moveri* est genus respectu machinarum

7 Legi ... no new paragraph in CLE 9 Primò ... no new paragraph in CLE 10 Praeterea ... no new
paragraph in CLE 14 Et ... no new paragraph in CLE

1 The *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, appended to the second edition of Descartes' *Meditationes de prima philosophiae*, Amsterdam: L. Elsevier, 1642.

2 No examples are known from the Dutch Reformed or the Walloon Church, but the Remonstrant theologians took advantage from Descartes' attack on Voetius. In one of his pamphlets Voetius' Remonstrant adversary Jean Batelier (1593–1672) published a Dutch translation of Descartes' comments on Voetius in the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (BATELIER 1642, 74; cf. VERBEEK 1992A, 23). For Voetius' polemic with Batelier, see DUKER 1989, II, 47–70.

3 Pierre Bourdin SJ (1595–1653), professor of mathematics and physics at the Jesuit College of Clermont in Paris, attacked some points in Descartes' *Essais* in 1640. He is also the author of the Seventh Set of Objections, published in the Amsterdam edition of the *Meditationes* (1642). Appended to the 1642 edition of the *Meditationes* is the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, in which Descartes complains to the Provincial of the Paris Jesuits, Jacques Dinet SJ (1584–1653), about the Jesuits' hesitations with respect to his philosophy. For Bourdin and Descartes, see ARIEW 1995. On the Jesuits' attitude towards Descartes' philosophy, see SORTAIS 1929; SORTAIS 1937; ARIEW 1999, 140–154.

4 A response to Vanden Waterlaet's *Prodromus*.

omnium quae sponte moventur, ad exclusionem aliarum quae sponte non moventur, ita *vita* sumi potest pro genere formas omnium viventium complectente.

Et, folio 96, ubi ais: *certè multò maiorem efficaciam* etc., mallet: *certè non minorem efficaciam* etc.; non enim est maior in uno quam in altero.

Denique, fol. 106, locum Ecclesiastae dicis à Salomone proferri ex personâ impiorum. Ego autem, in paginâ 579 editionis Parisiensis,⁵ eundem locum explicui, ex persona ipsius Ecclesiastae, ut peccatoris.⁶

Sed non video cui usui haec tua responsio esse possit, quia Capadox⁷ eâ est indignus, nisi rursus quid novi agat, et tunc unâ cum responsione ad istud novum sub nomine alicuius ex tuis discipulis edi posset; nunc existimo esse quiescendum. Nec etiam debes nostra in tuis lectionibus cum Galenicis et Aristotelicis miscere, nisi certus sis id tuo Magistratui esse gratum; mallet nullos haberes auditores, neque hoc tibi dedecori esset.⁸

Ad id quod obiicis de ideâ Dei solvendum, notare oportet non agi de essentiâ ideae, secundum quam ipsa est tantum modus quidam in mente humanâ existens, qui modus homine non est perfectior, sed de eius perfectione obiectivâ, quam principia Metaphysica docent debere contineri formaliter vel eminenter in eius causa;⁹ eodem modo ac si dicenti unumquemque hominem posse pingere tabellas aequè bene ac Apelles,¹⁰ quia illae constant tantum ex pigmentis diversimodè permixtis, potestque illa quilibet modis omnibus permiscere, esset respondendum, cum agimus de Apellis picturis, nos non tantum in iis considerare permixtionem colorum qualemcunque, sed illam quae fit certâ arte ad rerum similitudines repraesentandas, quaeque idcirco non nisi ab istius artis peritissimis fieri potest.¹¹

21 Et ... no new paragraph in CLE 27 Sed ... no new paragraph in CLE 34 Ad ... no new paragraph in CLE

5 AT VII 430–431.

6 Ecclesiastes, 8,17; 11,9.

7 See below, ll. 59–64.

8 Cf. R/D 44E.

9 Cf. *Meditationes*, AT VII 42; *Principia*, AT VIII 11. The principle that an effect can have nothing of perfection that did not previously exist in one of its causes, either formally or eminenty, is perfectly traditional indeed, but Descartes' claim that the same holds true for objective perfection, is not (see GOUDRIAAN 1999, 270–272).

10 Famous Greek painter (4th century BC).

11 Regius' view rejected by Descartes appears to be similar to the opinion advocated in Regius' *Explicatio*

Ad secundum respon- | deo, ex eo quod fatearis cogitationem esse 428
 attributum substantiae nullam extensionem includentis, et vice versâ ex-
 tensionem esse attributum substantiae nullam cogitationem includentis,
 tibi etiam fatendum esse substantiam cogitantem ab extensa distingui.
 50 Non enim habemus aliud signum quo unam substantiam ab aliâ differre
 cognoscamus, quam quod unam absque aliâ intelligamus. Et sanè potest
 Deus efficere quidquid possumus clarè intelligere; nec alia sunt quae
 à Deo fieri non posse dicuntur, quam quae repugnantiam involvunt in
 conceptu, hoc est quae non sunt intelligibilia; possumus autem clarè
 55 intelligere substantiam cogitantem non extensam, et extensam non cog-
 itantem, ut fateris. Iam coniungat et uniat illas Deus quantum potest,
 non ideò potest se omnipotentiâ suâ exuere, nec ideò sibi facultatem
 adimere ipsas seiungendi, ac proindè manent distinctae.¹²

Non potui notare ex tuo scripto an Monachum¹³ an Voëtium per
 60 Cappadocem intelligas, quod non displicuit: sibi sumat qui volet. Sed
 audio ignorari cuias sit Voëtius, adeo ut erga ipsum sis beneficus, si [568]
 Cappadociam ei in patriam assignes.¹⁴ Multum autem debes Monacho,
 quod auditorum tuorum numerum augeat.

46 Ad ... no new paragraph in CLE 53 quae AT] quod CLE 59 Non ... no new paragraph in CLE

mentis humanae (1647), viz. that our imperfect idea of God by no means warrants the actual existence of God: 'XIII. Imo ipsa Idea Dei, menti insita, est, vel ex divinâ revelatione, vel traditione, vel rerum observatione [cf. D/R 15, ll. 10–21]. XIV. Conceptus noster de Deo, sive idea Dei, in mente nostrâ existens, non est satis validum argumentum ad existentiam Dei probandam: cum non omnia existant, quorum conceptus in nobis observantur; atque haec idea, utpote à nobis concepta, idque imperfecte, non magis quam cuiusvis alius rei conceptus, vires nostras cogitandi proprias superet.' (AT VIII B 345); for Descartes' refutation of these claims, see *Notae in programma quoddam*, AT VIII B 359–363. Cf. VERBEEK 1992A, 60; VERBEEK 1993B, 12–13; VERBEEK 1999, 105–106.

12 Regius seems to have put the objection to Descartes that it is logically possible that a thinking substance and an extended substance are not distinct. Regius is clearly moving towards his view in the *Explicatio mentis humanae*: 'II. Quantum ad naturam rerum attinet, ea videtur pati, ut mens possit esse vel substantia, vel quidam substantiae corporeae modus; vel, si nonnullos alios Philosophantes sequamur, qui statuunt extensionem et cogitationem esse attributa, quae certis substantiis, tanquam subjectis, insunt, cum ea attributa non sint opposita, sed diversa, nihil obstat, quo minus mens possit esse attributum quoddam, eidem subjecto cum extensione conveniens, quamvis unum in alterius conceptu non comprehendatur. Quicquid enim possumus concipere, id potest esse. Atqui, ut mens aliquid horum sit, concipi potest; nam nullum horum implicat contradictionem. Ergo ea aliquid horum esse potest. III. Errant itaque, qui asserunt, nos humanam mentem clare et distincte, tanquam necessario à corpore realiter distinctam, concipere.' (AT VIII B 342–343); in thesis IV, Regius solves the question saying that it is revealed in Holy Scripture that mind and body are really distinct. For Descartes' refutation, see *Notae in programma quoddam*, AT VIII B 347–354. Cf. VERBEEK 1992A, 59–60; VERBEEK 1993B, 10–12; VERBEEK 1999, 106–107; FOWLER 1999, 343–344, 357–377.

13 Lambertus vanden Waterlaet (cf. D/R 42, n. 3).

14 In antiquity the Cappadocians stood in bad repute (cf. AT III 569).

Caeterum audiui à D. P.¹⁵ tibi animum esse huc nos invisendi. Ego
 65 verò te etiam atque etiam invito, neque te solum, sed et uxorem et filiam;
 mihi eritis gratissimi. Iam virent arbores, ac brevi etiam caerasa et pyra
 maturescent. Vale, et me ama.

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter is in reply to R/D 44 of [22 May/] 1 June 1642 (cf. my commentary on R/D 44).

Text

The text is closely studied by Verbeek, who argues that it consists of fragments of three different letters: I. paragraph 1 (end of May 1642); II. paragraphs 2–8 and paragraphs 11 and 12 (first week of April 1642); III. paragraphs 9 and 10 (1644–1645).¹⁶

Verbeek's argument to distinguish between part I and part II, is Descartes' allusion in the first paragraph to the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (*nostram de Voëtio historiam*, l. 1), published in the second edition of his *Meditationes* (Amsterdam 1642), whereas in the seventh paragraph (l. 25) Descartes refers to the first edition (Paris 1641). Part I being posterior to the publication of the Amsterdam edition in mid-May 1642,¹⁷ Verbeek dates it in late May.

According to Verbeek, part II, which contains Descartes' commentary on Regius' proposed answer to Vanden Waterlaet's *Prodromus*, antedates not only the Amsterdam edition, but the *Prodromus* as well. His argument rests on the interpretation of the Latin phrase *nisi rursus quid novi agat* (l. 28). The traditional interpretation is 'unless he makes another move', which suggests that Descartes asks Regius to publish his reply only if his opponent attacks him once again.¹⁸ Verbeek points out that *agere aliquid* usually means 'to discuss something', and the intention of the phrase would therefore be 'unless he discusses new things', or 'unless he puts forward new arguments', which may suggest that neither Descartes nor Regius are yet acquainted with the contents of Vanden Waterlaet's *Prodromus*. If so, Regius prepared a response to the *Prodromus* before its publication on April 10, and the letter consequently dates from early April 1642.

Verbeek's arguments are not compelling, and the two points he raises are inconclusive. First, concerning the reference to the Paris edition of the *Meditationes*, one

64 Caeterum ... *no new paragraph in CLE*

15 Adam and Tannery conjecture Pollot, but Picot is more likely, in which case *huc nos invisendi* includes him as well (cf. R/D 44F, ll. 9–14).

16 VERBEEK 1999.

17 Cf. R/D 44, n. 9.

18 Cf. AM V 202; RL, 123; B, 218.

needs to take into consideration that the reference may be inserted by Clerselier for the convenience of the French readers.¹⁹ In the original manuscript the reference could have been to the Amsterdam edition, or perhaps Descartes did not specify the place at all. As for Verbeek's second point, the interpretation of the phrase *nisi rursus quid novi agat*, his reading is plausible, but on the other hand, there is nothing implausible to the traditional reading either. The phrase is ambiguous, and one needs to look for additional indications for its proper interpretation.

In my view, there is enough evidence to sustain the traditional date of June 1642 for parts I and II. First, Descartes' remark 'You are much indebted to the monk, because he increases your audience' (ll. 62–63), indicates that the work had already been published. Consequently, the traditional interpretation of the phrase discussed is to be preferred. Second, Descartes writes 'In your lessons you must not mix our [philosophy] with the Galenic and Aristotelian, unless you are convinced that it pleases your Magistrates; I'd rather see you had no audience, which would not dishonor you' (ll. 30–33). This is clearly in reply to R/D 44E, in which Regius informed Descartes that if he did not discuss new opinions in his medical courses, he would lose most of his students. R/D 44 being of 1 June, part II postdates the Amsterdam edition of the *Meditationes*, and consequently Verbeek's argument to distinguish between parts I and II is invalid.

Finally, part III, in which Descartes replies to two objections (*objicis*, l. 34) by Regius. Verbeek shows that these objections resemble the theses in Regius' *Explicatio mentis humanae* (1647), which the Utrecht professor cancelled from his *Fundamenta physices* in order to appease Descartes. Part III may therefore belong to the discussion between Descartes and Regius on the publication of the *Fundamenta physices* in June and July 1645. Verbeek mentions another possibility, namely that the objections were made after reading the *Principia*. In any case, according to Verbeek part III dates from 1644–1645, rather than 1642. In my view, the fact that Regius poses objections, implies that he reacts to a work by Descartes, and this may be the *Principia*, as Verbeek suggests, but it cannot be excluded that he refers to the *Meditationes*, which text Regius already knew (cf. R/D 12C), but he had never seen the voluminous Objections and Replies. The date 'June 1642' is admittedly uncertain, but lacking any further indications, it cannot well be separated from the other parts of D/R 45.

¹⁹ Clerselier occasionally adds a reference or substitutes preexisting references with references to French editions/translations of Descartes' works. See my Introduction, xxxii.

46

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

[Winter 1642–1643]

Vie, II, 157 [A]; 177 [B]; 184–185 [C] (no. 25).
 AT, III, 562 [A] (no. 278); 571 [B] (no. 281–II); AT, VIII B, 195–196 [C, partly].

[A] = R/D 43A

Pour ce qui est de la réfutation que Voetius avait entreprise contre la réponse de M. Regius à ses thèses par le ministère de ses étudiants, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 25 MS. de Regius.] l'on peut dire qu'elle échoua entre les mains d'un moine renégat, ou fugitif, comme l'appelle M. Regius, pour avoir voulu dissimuler qu'il en fût l'auteur. Pour éloigner le public encore davantage de cette pensée, il avait confié l'écrit à ce moine pour l'aller faire imprimer à Leyde, afin qu'il parût que Messieurs Descartes et Regius avaient encore des ennemis ailleurs qu'à Utrecht. [...] ¹ Mais le Recteur de l'Université de Leyde qui était M. Golius, [*i.m.*: Lettre 20 MS. de Reg.] ² ayant été averti de ce qui se passait, se transporta incontinent chez l'imprimeur de cette réfutation, et fit faire en sa présence une information de cette entreprise. ³ [*i.m.*: Item. lettr. 25 MS.] L'imprimeur la rejeta toute sur le moine, qui se trouva heureusement absent de l'imprimerie, et qui prit la fuite pour aller à Utrecht donner avis à Voetius de ce qui était arrivé à son ouvrage, et lui rendre compte de sa commission. ⁴

[B] (In continuation of R/D 44C)

Jusque-là Voetius n'avait point fait difficulté de mettre son nom à tous les libelles qu'il avait publiés en forme de thèses contre sa philosophie, et dont le nombre montait jusqu'à sept différents écrits, en comprenant les thèses de son fils sur les formes substantielles, et le Jugement Académique de l'Université d'Utrecht qui ⁵ était aussi de sa composition. ⁵ Mais pour ne point dégoûter le public de son nom, et

¹ In the passage omitted Baillet paraphrases D/R 42 (ll. 9–13).

² R/D 43.

³ Cf. R/D 43A.

⁴ See my commentary on R/D 43A.

⁵ Baillet's source is without question the *Lettre apologétique*: 'ie puis conter sept divers imprimez par lesquels il avoit tasché de me nuire, avant que j'eusse jamais rien écrit, ou dit, ou fait contre luy. A sçavoir quatre differens de *Atheismo* [VOETIUS 1639]; un cinquième, qu'il nommoit *Corollaria thesibus de Iubileo subiecta*; un sixième, qui estoit *Appendix ad ista Corollaria*, ou *Theses de formis substantialibus*; et enfin, le *Iudicium Academiae Ultrajectinae*, pour le septième; non pas que ie veuille rien oster de la part que ses confreres pretendent à ce dernier; mais, parce qu'il estoit alors leur Recteur, ils ne peuvent nier que la principale ne luy appartienne. (AT VIII B 210). Baillet substitutes *Theses de formis substantialibus* with Paulus Voet's disputation against Regius (VOET 1642; cf. R/D 41, ll. 25–26).

pour faire croire que M. Descartes avait encore d'autres ennemis que lui, il voulut que Schoockius mît son nom à la tête du livre comme s'il en eût été le véritable père, ou l'unique auteur.⁶ C'était un artifice propre à tirer Voetius d'embarras, au cas que le succès du livre ne fût pas heureux. Mais comme cet artifice ne parut qu'à

10 la fin de l'édition du livre, où l'on réserve ordinairement à tirer la feuille du titre et la préface, M. Descartes y fut trompé. [*I.m.*: Lettr. 25 MS. de Reg.] Car ayant appris que le livre qu'on disait être composé par Voetius s'imprimait à Utrecht par ses soins, et en ayant reçu les six premières feuilles, sans qu'il y fût fait mention de Schoockius, et sans même qu'on eût encore oui parler de ce jeune homme; et

15 ayant voulu le réfuter, [*i.m.*: Epist. ad celeberr. Voet. pag. 78, 79, 80, et passim.⁷] à mesure qu'on l'imprimait, sans attendre la fin de l'édition, il fut surpris de voir que l'adversaire qu'il avait apostrophé dans sa réponse à face découverte ne lui parût plus qu'un masque dans la suite.⁸

[C]

Les honnêtetés de M. Desmarests⁹ ne servirent qu'à irriter cet esprit intraitable [Voetius], comme avaient fait celles que M. Regius avait employées dans sa Réponse à ses thèses des formes substantielles. Peu de jours après il dressa tumultuairement un libelle de peu de feuillets contre le livre de Desmarests, et il

5 eut l'effronterie de le faire paraître sous le nom supposé d'un Ministre de Bois-le-Duc et sous le titre de *Retorsio Calumniarum quas Tertullus Societatis Marianae Advocatus, etc.*¹⁰ [*I.m.*: Allusion à ce Tertullus Avocat contre S. Paul.¹¹] Mais il fut condamné incontinent par le Magistrat de la police, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 25 MS. de Reg.] comme un libelle diffamatoire, rempli de mensonges et d'impostures, et

10 propre à exciter des séditions; sa lecture fut défendue par les crieurs publics au

⁶ *Admiranda methodus* (SCHOOCK 1643).

⁷ AT VIII B 55–56.

⁸ See my commentary on *Admiranda methodus*.

⁹ In August 1642, the Groningen professor of theology, Samuel Maresius (1599–1673), forwarded a copy of his *Defensio pietatis* (MARESIUS 1642) to Voetius, together with a letter, put in most friendly terms, in which he expressed his hope that the work would take away Voetius' misunderstanding regarding the Brotherhood of the Holy Virgin at 's-Hertogenbosch. See my commentary on the Brotherhood affair. On Samuel Maresius or Desmarests, see NNWB, II, 868–870; BLGNP, I, 158–160; NAUTA 1935.

¹⁰ Baillet's source is the sixth part of Descartes' *Epistola ad Voetium*, devoted to the Brotherhood affair (AT VIII B 64–107). In the *Epistola ad Voetium* Descartes attributes the pamphlet to Voetius: 'Atqui nihilominus, eo accepto [*sc.* MARESIUS 1642], non aliter quam paulo ante visâ modestissimâ Regii ad tuas theses de formis substantialibus responsione [*sc.* REGIUS 1642], summopere excanduisti; [...] statimque prodiit extemporaneus libellus, qui creditur à te scriptus esse, nam clare in eo cognoscuntur tui mores, et tuus stylus; et prodit sine nomine, sub personâ unius è ministris Sylvae-ducis' (AT VIII B 75–76). The author of the pamphlet *Retorsio calumniarum*, is the 's-Hertogenbosch minister Cornelis Leemans, or Lemannus (c.1599–1668; NNWB, II, 797; VAN LIEBURG 1996, I, 148), a fact which Descartes came to know afterwards (cf. *Lettre apologétique*, AT VIII B 235).

¹¹ Acts 24,1–2.

son du tambour* [in margine: *Ou de la cloche ou du tocsin.] et de la trompette, [*i.m.*: *sono tubarum et tympanorum*, pag. 420 de Confraternit. Marian.¹²] comme Voetius même a eu soin de le faire savoir à la postérité.¹³

Le libelle diffamatoire du prétendu Ministre de Bois-le-Duc contre le livre
 15 de Desmarets n'était que l'avant-coureur d'un juste volume que Voetius entreprit
 à la hâte pour fronder la confrérie de Notre-Dame de Bois-le-Duc. Les Magistrats
 de cette ville en eurent avis; et s'étant assemblés pour délibérer des moyens de
 réprimer l'insolence de ce brouillon, ils en écrivirent en corps aux États de la
 province d'Utrecht, et aux Magistrats de la ville.¹⁴ Voetius se vanta même depuis,
 20 [*i.m.*: Pag. 421 de Confrat. Marian.] qu'ils lui firent l'honneur de lui écrire en
 particulier, pour lui faire tomber la plume des mains; mais que ce fut en vain.¹⁵ Car
 encore que le Magistrat d'Utrecht eût arrêté l'impression de ce nouveau livre, [*i.m.*:
 Lettr. 25 MS. de Reg.] et qu'il eût défendu à Voetius de la continuer pour satisfaire
 aux ordres des États de la province,¹⁶ [*i.m.*: Tom. 2 des lettr. de Desc. pag. 41.¹⁷] il
 25 ne laissa point d'agir secrètement pendant les mois de Novembre et de Décembre,
 s'étant contenté de changer l'imprimeur et la forme du livre, qui d'in-VIII^e devint
 in-XII^e, afin qu'il pût le faire voir [*i.m.*: Argum. Ep. ad celeb. Voet.¹⁸] au Synode
Gallo-Belgique qui devait s'assembler à La Haye en 1643; [*i.m.*: Lettr. 25 MS. de
 Reg.] et que se relevant de l'obéissance qu'il devait aux Magistrats laïcs par
 30 l'autorité ecclésiastique du Synode, auquel Messieurs de Bois-le-Duc avaient bien
 voulu s'en rapporter pour décider de leur confrérie, il trouvât moyen d'y rendre sa

12 Baillet's source is, once more, the *Epistola ad Voetium* (cf. AT VIII B 77).

13 Leeman's pamphlet was prohibited on 6 November 1642 NS, cf. DUKER 1989, II, 113; NAUTA 1935, 174; VAN DIJCK 1973, 337. The text of the sentence is in MARESIUS 1645, 324, and partly in the *Epistola ad Voetium* as well (AT VIII B 77).

14 A copy of the letter to the States of Utrecht is kept in RAU, Archief van de Staten, inv. no. 471. Cf. VAN DIJCK 1973, 346. The text of the letter to the Utrecht Vroedschap, dated 19 November NS like the letter to the States, is in BURMAN 1738, 404–408.

15 The text of the letter, dated 19 November NS, is in MARESIUS 1645, 332–334; DUKER 1989, II, appendix XXXVII. Voetius' reply to the Vroedschap of 's-Hertogenbosch is lost, but it is outlined in *Kort ende oprecht verhael*, 11; MARESIUS 1645, 326; VOETIUS 1648–1669, III, 352. Cf. DUKER 1989, II, 116.

16 Baillet is mistaken here: on 26 November/6 December 1642 the Vroedschap decided that Voetius' response to Maresius ought to be published (*Resolutiën*, 164–165). The basis of Baillet's error is Descartes' letter to Maresius, to which letter the biographer refers in the margin (see note 17).

17 Descartes got hold of three quires of Voetius' *Confraternitas Mariana* and sent them to Maresius: 'Ces trois feüilles estoient in octavo, et sont venuës de ie ne sçay où; mais depuis on a retiré soigneusement tous les exemplaires, et on l'imprime maintenant in duodecim chez un autre libraire que celui de l'Université, où s'imprime aussi le livre contre moy, sans que je sçache la cause de ce changement, sinon que ie coniecture de là que Messieurs de la Ville ne veulent pas authoriser cette impression', Descartes to Maresius, [January/February 1643], AT III 606. In *Vie*, the marginal reference to the letter to Maresius is accidentally exchanged with the next reference. I have restored the correct order.

18 'Cumque deinde ista editio [sc. *Admiranda methodus*] fuisset aliquamdiu intermissa, propter librum de Confraternitate Marianâ, cujus impressionem apud eundem Typographum Voetius magis urgebat, ut prodiret ante tempus Synodi Gallo-Belgicae, nuper Hagae habitae, in quâ de re à se in eo impugnata actum iri putabat', *Epistola ad Voetium*, AT VIII B 6.

cause triomphante.¹⁹ Messieurs de Bois-le-Duc furent avertis du peu de soumission qu'il témoignait pour ses supérieurs. Quelques-uns en furent indignés, et entre autres M. Brederodius²⁰ Protestant, [*i.m.*: Ibid. lettr. 25.] personnage qualifié, qui
 35 était de la confrérie, et qui fit menacer Voetius de lui faire donner les écrivains. [*I.m.*: Item lettr. 26 MS. de Reg.²¹] Mais les autres aimant mieux le mépriser, jugèrent plus à propos de l'abandonner à ses propres inquiétudes.²² Il parut même que Voetius avait trop présumé de la faveur des Ministres des sept Provinces unies qui se trouvèrent au Synode *Gallo-Belgique*. [*I.m.*: Art. 24 Synodi Gallo-
 40 Belg. ann. 1643.²³] Malgré le zèle qu'ils avaient tous à détruire jusqu'aux moindres vestiges de l'ancienne Religion, ils se crurent obligés d'approuver la conduite de Messieurs de Bois-le-Duc, et de blâmer celle de leur confrère Voetius. Il n'y eut que la considération du ministère qu'ils honoraient dans eux-mêmes, et l'appréhension de donner sujet aux Catholiques de les remercier, qui arrêta leur censure.

19 The Walloon Synod was held in The Hague in April 1643 (the resolutions are dated 15 April). Against the Voetians, who claimed that the Synod decided in their favor, Descartes argued that, while the Synod disapproved Maresius' defence of the brotherhood without the Synod's consent, the Synod implicitly condemned Voetius as well for publishing slander without the Synod's approval (*Epistola ad Voetium*, AT VIII B 8–10). In a letter to Rivet, Maresius denied he had given the Synod's proceedings to Descartes (NAUTA 1935, 508). Van Dijk (VAN DIJCK 1973, 360) mentions De Wilhem as a possible source for Descartes' knowledge of the proceedings, but their correspondence does not contain any indication to this effect. A more likely candidate is the Walloon minister and chaplain of the French regiments in the Dutch army Abraham de Mory (c.1600–1645), a close friend of Huygens', who participated in the Synod (on Descartes, Huygens, and De Mory, see AT I 274, 316, 610, 629; IV, 78, 299; on De Mory and Maresius, see NAUTA 1935, 169, 179, 437, 495, 514. Further biographical information on De Mory in STELLING-MICHAUD 1959–1980, IV, 601 and BOTS/LEROY 1978–1980, 3, 219–220). On 22 May 1643, Descartes sent De Mory and De Wilhem a copy of the *Epistola ad Voetium* via Huygens (ROTH 1926, 199/AT III 815). For the Brotherhood-affair and the Walloon Synod, see DUKER 1989, II, 71–131; NAUTA 1935, 172–183; VAN DIJCK 1973, 322–381. The acts/resolutions of the Synod are published in *Livre Synodal*, I, 439–444.

20 Johan Wolphaert van Brederode (1599–1655), one of the last in line of the famous Dutch noble family Van Brederode. After the seizure of 's-Hertogenbosch by Frederik Hendrik in 1629, he became governor of the city and the Meierij. Through his marriages in 1619, and again in 1638, he became affiliated both to the House of Nassau and to the House of Orange. In July 1642 he was appointed field-marshal, next to the Stadholders the highest in command of the Dutch army. On Van Brederode, see NNBW, X, 125–126; VOET 1656, 155–169; KOENHEIN/HENIGER 1999.

21 R/D 47.

22 Baillet concludes the paragraph outlining the Synod's decisions in *casu*. While Descartes states that Voetius was at least implicitly condemned (see note 19), Baillet, whose only source is the *Epistola ad Voetium*, wrongly claims that membership of the brotherhood was approved, and Voetius blamed for his interference.

23 *Livre synodal*, I, 442–443; also in AT VIII B 8, n. b.

COMMENTARY

Date

Text C contains references to several events of a known date: a) the interdiction of Leeman's pamphlet *Retorsio calumniarum* by the 's-Hertogenbosch magistracy on 6 November 1642 NS; b) the letters by the same magistrates to the Utrecht States, Vroedschap (both 16 November NS), and Voetius (19 November NS). Baillet next relates the reaction of Van Brederode to Voetius' refusal to withdraw his response to Maresius. The date I suggest is December 1642/January 1643.

Text

See my commentary on R/D 44.

*Context**1. The affair of the Brotherhood of the Holy Virgin*

In 1642, several reformed citizens of 's-Hertogenbosch asked the Brotherhood of the Holy Virgin to be allowed to join them, which, after much debate, was granted.²⁴ Informed of this fact by the Walloon minister Cornelis Leemans, Voetius organised a dispute in which he unambiguously condemned the participation in Catholic idolatry.²⁵ In their turn, the new members of the Brotherhood asked the help of the Groningen theologian Samuel Maresius, who had been a Walloon minister at 's-Hertogenbosch between 1636 and 1641, to write a defence. In August 1642, Maresius sent his *Defensio pietatis* to Voetius, naively thinking that it would soothe Voetius. In reality, it meant the start of a long and bitter animosity between the two theologians. As soon as the word spread that Voetius prepared an elaborate reply to Maresius, the magistrates of 's-Hertogenbosch requested the Utrecht States, Vroedschap and Voetius himself to abandon publication, but to no avail. Voetius' *Specimen assertionum* appeared early in March 1643, just in time for Descartes to discuss the whole affair in detail in his *Epistola ad Voetium*.²⁶ One of Descartes' informants on the affair, as R/D 47C suggests, was Regius.

2. Schoock's Admiranda methodus novae philosophiae cartesianae

Published in the Spring of 1643, Schoock's *Admiranda methodus novae philosophiae cartesianae* is one of the first elaborate attempts to refute Cartesianism. It attacks Descartes' metaphysics, as laid down in his *Discours* and *Meditationes*, and Cartesian physics, as taught by Regius at Utrecht University. Fundamental criticism is combined with blunt slander, reason enough for Descartes for never meeting Schoock on philosophical ground.

²⁴ For the Brotherhood affair, see DUKER 1989, II, 71–130; NAUTA 1935, 172–183, 241–244; VAN DIJCK 1973, 322–335. Further details on persons and publications mentioned below, are found in my notes to R/D 47C.

²⁵ *De idololatria indirecta et participata*, VOETIUS 1642A.

²⁶ Descartes' motivation to incorporate a lengthy analysis of the affair in his *Epistola ad Voetium* is discussed in VERBEEK 1992A, 25 and in my introduction to DESCARTES 1996, 18–19.

At first, Descartes believed that the book was the work of his Utrecht opponent, Gisbertus Voetius, as it was being printed in Utrecht, at the press where the theologian usually had his works printed. It was indeed Voetius' idea, but he implored his former student Schoock — since 1641 professor of philosophy at Groningen University — for help, when the latter was in Utrecht visiting his relatives in the summer of 1642.²⁷ Voetius c.s. did everything to ensure a thorough but chiefly a quick response: the helpful student Vanden Waterlaet supplied excerpts from a student's notebook of Regius' physics, and Johan Godschalk van Schurman, the brother of Anna Maria van Schurman, provided a partial translation of Descartes' *Discours*, as Schoock had no knowledge of the French language. Before returning to Groningen, the first part was finished, and left in Voetius' hands. In order to exert pressure on Schoock, Voetius had the first part printed at the end of October. Apparently with reluctance, Schoock wrote the second part, and the book finally appeared in March 1643. Barely two years later, in April 1645, Schoock renounced the authorship of the work before an official committee of inquiry at Groningen University, instituted on behalf of Descartes. He pointed to Voetius and his accomplices as the persons responsible for the offensive character of *Admiranda methodus*. According to Schoock, his intention had been to discuss philosophy only, whereas the Voetian faction, seeing the manuscript through the press, had changed and added to the original work so that he did not recognise it when it was finally published. Schoock's confession confirmed Descartes' belief that Voetius was the true author of *Admiranda methodus*, but the gain of his small victory over Schoock was limited (cf. the commentary on R/D 55).²⁸

²⁷ Schoock had aided Voetius in his polemics on a number of occasions before, cf. BOS 1998, 185–189.

²⁸ The history of Schoock's *Admiranda methodus* is extensively dealt with in DUKER 1989, II, 175–186, III, 229–245; *Querelle*, 52–61; VERBEEK 1992A, 20–23, 30–33; BOS 1999A.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

[before May 1643]

Vie, II, 179 (no. 26).
AT, III, 573 (no. 281–III).

(In continuation of R/D 49B)

M. Regius se trouvait enveloppé dans la fortune de M. Descartes; mais quoique le gros de l'orage parût détourné de sa tête par la grande diversion que l'Épître au P. Dinet avait faite sur M. Descartes, il paraissait néanmoins plus à plaindre que lui, parce qu'il était justiciable du tribunal que Voetius assiégeait par ses amis et ses intrigues. [*I.m.*: Lettr. MS. de Regius 26.¹] Voetius avait remarqué que la plupart des vérités que M. Descartes avait débitées de lui au P. Dinet ne pouvaient lui avoir été révélées que par M. Regius.² Il ne se trompait point; mais c'était par une nouvelle injustice qu'il prétendait le poursuivre dorénavant comme un traître, ne l'ayant regardé jusqu'à présent que comme un novateur, un brouillon et un ennemi de l'Aristote des écoles. [*I.m.*: Tom. 3 des Lettr. pag. 390, 391.³] Il ne sollicitait rien moins que son abdication, et l'on parlait déjà tout communément de la perte de sa chaire, comme de l'histoire d'un fait arrivé.⁴ De sorte qu'on ne le considérait plus que comme la victime de l'Université et le *premier martyr* de la secte cartésienne. [*I.m.*: Pag. 6 du 3 vol.⁵]

1 Letter 26 in the Clerselier collection is mentioned in R/D 46C (l. 36) as well.

2 See my commentary.

3 This is probably a misprint, as the letter referred to is a letter to Mersenne of 27 May 1638 (AT II 135–153/CM VII 225–242), which even predates Descartes' acquaintance with Regius. Adam and Tannery silently correct Baillet's reference to 590 and 591, being, as they conjecture, a letter to Pollot of March 1642 (AT III 550–551), in which Descartes mentions the rumour that Regius has been sacked. I accept Adam and Tannery's emendation, and the addressee proposed is very plausible as well. However, the date, March 1642, is mistaken. I thank Theo Verbeek for pointing out to me that the date of the letter is probably September 1643. Descartes writes that the Utrecht Magistrate has not yet condemned his book (AT III 551, l. 6), which can only refer to his *Epistola ad Voetium*.

4 The rumour of Regius' discharge circulated in September 1643, cf. Descartes' letter to Pollot mentioned in the previous note; Descartes to Huygens, 20 September 1643, ROTH 1926, 210–211/AT IV 750–751. Huygens contradicts the rumour in his reply to Descartes of 5 October (ROTH 1926, 215/AT IV 755).

5 'Je ne parle point de ce qui s'est passé pendant ces années là au regard de Monsieur Regius, qu'on pensoit enseigner mes opinions touchant la Philosophie, et qui a esté en hazard d'en estre le premier Martyr', *Lettre apologétique*, AT VIII B 208.

COMMENTARY

Date and context

Baillet does not give the date of the letter, but in any case it was written after the publication of the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, as Regius relates he is accused of being Descartes' informer (cf. ll. 5–6). Because the *Epistola ad Voetium* is not mentioned alongside the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet*, I conjecture that Regius' letter was written before May 1643. When Descartes prepared the *Epistola ad Voetium*, Regius acted once again as Descartes' informer (cf. R/D 46 and R/D 48), and at a certain point Regius may have requested Descartes to conceal his source.

Descartes indeed attempts to safeguard his friend in the following passage in the *Epistola ad Voetium*:

Sed sane mihi valde fuit mirum, quod cum nuper hoc ipsum et alia nonnulla, quae melius scire debet quam caeteri, ab illo quaesivissem, nihil aliud responderit, quam se non posse mecum agere de istis rebus. Cuius responsi ab alio amico rationem quaerens, audivi Regio antea dictum esse, aliquem è magistratu ei culpa imputare, quod ego nonnulla de te in epist. ad P. Dinet scripsissem, quae vix ab alio videbar discere potuisse. Quod verum esse ...⁶

Given Baillet's testimony on letters R/D 46 and R/D 48 Regius' timid reply is without a doubt an invention. And it actually failed to prevent new accusations: in September 1643 the professor of medicine was interrogated by a committee of inquiry on being the source of Descartes' allegations against Voetius in the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* and the *Epistola ad Voetium*.⁷

Text

See my commentary on R/D 44.

⁶ AT VIII B 29–30.

⁷ *Resolutiën*, 183, 184–185. The interrogation by the committee — instituted by the Vroedschap to investigate Descartes' claims in the *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* and the *Epistola ad Voetium* — may have triggered the rumour that Regius was about to be dismissed.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]
[between early December 1642 and May 1643]

Vie, II, 155 [A], 188–189 [B] (no. 36).
AT, III, 557 [A].

[A] = R/D 41B, II. 10–22

Il n’y eut que huit Professeurs qui eurent part à ce jugement.¹ [*I.m.*: Lettr. 36 MS. de Reg. à Desc.] Savoir G. Voetius, Ch. Dematius, M. Schotanus, A. Mathaeus, G. Stratenus, J. Liraeus, Arn. Senguerdius, et Dan. Berckringer, qui prononcèrent contre la réponse de M. Regius à Voetius et contre la philosophie nouvelle. Les autres furent honteux de suivre la passion de Voetius, mais ils étaient les plus faibles.² Il n’y eut que M. Emilius qui forma opposition à ce jugement, et M. Cyprien, [*i.m.*: Cyprianus Regneri, qui ne connaissait point M. Descartes et n’était point ami particulier de Regius.] Professeur en droit, qui protesta de nullité, voyant que l’on n’alléguait aucune raison recevable pour rendre ce jugement valide. Il voulut même qu’il fût fait mention de son opposition dans l’acte du jugement, et qu’on le nommât pour n’être point confondu mal à propos avec les auteurs d’une action si peu raisonnable sous le nom général des Professeurs de l’Université.³ [*I.m.*: Narrat. histor.]

[B]

Peu de jours après de sa publication⁴ l’on vit paraître à Amsterdam chez Elsevier la réponse de M. Descartes sous le titre d’*Epistola Ren. Descartes ad celeberrimum virum D. Gisbertum Voetium, in quâ examinantur duo libri nuper pro Voetio Ultrajecti simul editi; unus de confraternitate Marianâ, alter de Philosophiâ Cartesianâ* [*i.m.*: En Latin et en Flamand.]⁵ [...]⁶ La seconde et la septième [parties] sont une espèce d’information particulière que l’on fait de la conduite de

1 The formal judgement by the Senate of Regius’ *Responsio*, issued in March 1642 (see my commentary on R/D 37, *Context*).

2 Cf. R/D 41B, n. 9.

3 Cf. R/D 41B, n. 10.

4 *Admiranda methodus* (SCHOOCK 1643), published in March 1643 (cf. my commentary on R/D 46).

5 On 22 May 1643 Descartes sent Huygens several copies of the *Epistola ad Voetium* (ROTH 1926, 199/AT III 815). The Dutch translation (DESCARTES 1643B) appeared in the summer of 1643. Cf. BOS 1999A, 57, n. 11.

6 Baillet supplies an indication of the contents, taken from the *Argumentum* to the *Epistola ad Voetium* (AT VIII B 11–12).

Voetius;⁷ et la qua- | trième est un jugement de ses livres et de sa doctrine,⁸ d'où 189
 il faut excepter ceux qu'il avait écrits contre l'Église Romaine, et quelques autres
 que M. Regius n'avait pu trouver chez les Libraires d'Utrecht.⁹ [*I.m.*: Lettr. 36
 10 MS. de Regius.]

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet does not give the date of the letter. But as it is connected to Descartes' preparation for his *Epistola ad Voetium*, the letter was probably written between early December 1642, when Descartes got hold of the first quires of Schoock's *Admiranda methodus*,¹⁰ and May 1643, when the *Epistola ad Voetium* appeared.¹¹

Text

Adam and Tannery only give text A, and they probably decided not to list the letter separately, because text A does not provide a clear indication of the date of the letter, and, moreover, it is conveniently imbedded between two references to R/D 41 discussing the Senate's judgement of the *Responsio*. However, the additional text B provides the necessary context to grant the letter its own place.

7 'In secundâ [parte], remunerero dominum Voetium narratione quorundam ejus factorum, ex quibus ipsius virtutes primum nosse coepi. [...] In septimâ, quid meritus sit dominus Voetius, et quale specimen charitatis Christianae ac probitatis libro isto exhibuerit, considero', *Argumentum*, AT VIII B 11–12.

8 'In quartâ, meam de usu librorum et doctrinâ Voetii sententiam expono', *Argumentum*, AT VIII B 11.

9 Voetius' works discussed in the *Epistola ad Voetium* are *De praejudiciis* (VOETIUS 1634; cf. AT VIII B 36); *Thersites heautontimorumenos* (VOETIUS 1635; cf. AT VIII B 62–63, 95, 149–150, 166–167); *De atheismo* (VOETIUS 1639; cf. AT VIII B 53–55, 166–167, 176, 182); *Catechisatie* (VOETIUS 1641; cf. AT VIII B 171); *De idololatria indirecta et participata, pars tertia* (VOETIUS 1642A; cf. AT VIII B 69ff); *Specimen assertionum* (VOETIUS 1642B). The works 'against the Roman Church' are probably Voetius' writings in his polemic in the first half of the 1630s with the Leuven professor of theology and since 1636 bishop of Ieper, Cornelius Jansenius (1585–1638). Voetius' polemic with Jansenius is indirectly referred to in the *Epistola ad Voetium* (AT VIII B 179–180). For this polemic on the question whether or not the Dutch ministers (among whom Voetius) had a legitimate mission in the captured town of 's-Hertogenbosch, see DUKER 1989, I, 337–348; LAMBRIGHTS 1989; ORCIBAL 1989, 193–205.

10 Cf. Descartes to Mersenne, 7 December 1644, AT III 598/CM XI 364.

11 See text B, n. 5.

Regius to Descartes [Endegeest]

[late July or August 1643]

Vie, II, 177 [A]; 178–179 [B]; 204–205 [C] (nos. 23 and 24).
 AT, III, 571–572 [A]; 572–573 [B]; (no. 281–IV); AT, VIII B, 337, note c [C].

[A] (In continuation of R/D 46B)

Mais s'étant douté de la dissimulation du personnage sur certaines expressions de son livre¹ qui ne lui [Voetius] convenaient pas, et qui marquaient que l'auteur [*i.m.*: Lettr. 23 MS. de Reg.] *enseignait la philosophie dans le coin le plus reculé des Pays-Bas, et honorait Voetius son maître comme s'il eût été son père,*²
 5 il [Descartes] voulut bien le traiter dans la continuation de sa réponse comme un auteur déguisé, sans cesser néanmoins de parler à lui, parce que l'incivilité du style, la grossièreté des injures, la répétition continuelle des mêmes calomnies, et les autres caractères de l'esprit de Voetius qu'il reconnaissait dans ce livre [*i.m.*: Tom. 3 des lettr. pag. 8.³] ne lui permettaient point de parler à d'autres.

[B] (In continuation of R/D 44D)

[*I.m.*: Item. lettr. 23 MS. du même.] Il [Voetius] consulta quelques avocats de ses amis sur l'affront public qu'il en recevait, et prit des mesures pour l'appeler en justice et lui intenter dans les formes un procès en réparation d'honneur envers une personne de son rang, un premier Professeur en théologie, un premier Min-
 5 istre de l'Évangile des plus réformés, occupant la place que les prélats y avaient possédée avant la Réformation. De sorte qu'écrivant et agissant tout à la fois contre M. Descartes, il avait intention *de le battre, et de lui faire encore payer l'amende.* [*I.m.*: Tom. 3 des lettr. pag. 7, 8, etc.⁴]

Dès le mois de Juin de l'an 1642, la conspiration avait commencé entre les
 10 deux Voetius père et fils et Schoockius, que M. Regius ne désigne dans ses lettres

1 Schoock's *Admiranda methodus*.

2 Adam and Tannery consider the emphasized words *enseignait ... père* as a direct quotation from Regius' letter, but this is by no means certain. As Baillet states, the phrase consists of two expressions found in Schoock's *Admiranda methodus*. Regius may have pointed them out to Descartes, but perhaps Baillet took the phrase from the *Epistola ad Voetium*, where it is found on the exact place Baillet referred to a few lines earlier (see R/D 46B, l. 30): 'Verum tamen quia, in pag. 33, Author ait se *in extremo Belgii angulo docere*, ac pag. 57 nominat te suum *Praeceptorem instar parentis aeternum colendum*' (AT VIII B 55–56).

3 *Lettre apologétique*, AT VIII B 211–212.

4 'En effet, il se piqua de telle sorte, que i'appris un peu apres, qu'il consultoit pour me faire un procez d'injures, et qu'il composoit cependant contre moy divers écrits: en sorte qu'il avoit dessein de me battre, et de m'appeller en justice en mesme temps, afin que le battu payast l'amande', *Lettre apologétique*, AT VIII B 210–211.

que du nom de moine renégat, [*i.m.*: Voyez ci-dessus.⁵] pour écrire conjointement contre M. Descartes.⁶ Mais elle ne produisit sa conclusion qu'à la foire du mois de Juillet suivant, [*i.m.*: Tom. 3 des lettr. pag. 40, et 32.⁷] pendant laquelle Schoockius, étant venu à Utrecht voir ses amis selon sa coutume, s'était laissé engager, à l'issue
 15 d'un grand et magnifique repas que lui avait donné Voetius, de prendre la plume en faveur de son ancien maître contre l'Épître au P. Dinet. Schoockius ne témoignait pas d'abord toute l'ardeur qu'on souhaitait d'un disciple zélé pour l'honneur du maître; mais le redoublement des instances que lui fit Voetius, qui se fit joindre
 20 aussi par Dematius et d'autres de ses amis qu'il avait priés à dîner avec lui, acheva de le résoudre à faire ce qu'il voulait. [*I.m.*: Tom. 3 des lettr. pag. 32, 33, 34, 35.⁸] Il fut donc réglé que Schoockius emporterait à Groningue les mémoires qui lui seraient fournis d'Utrecht, et que, quand il les aurait mis en ordre, il enverrait incessamment ce qu'il en aurait dressé pour être imprimé à Utrecht sous sa direction. [*I.m.*: Item. lettr. 23 MS. de Reg.] C'est ce qui fit languir en partie
 25 l'impression de l'ouvrage jusqu'en 1643.⁹ [*I.m.*: Lettr. 22,¹⁰ 23, 24, etc. de Regius MS.] Mais Voetius, pour soutenir l'es- | pérance de ses écoliers, et du petit peuple 179 à qui il publiait ses chagrins et ses desseins contre M. Descartes, avait soin de répéter ses vieilles calomnies, et d'en forger de nouvelles dans sa classe et dans ses autres entretiens, sans oublier de les faire entrer de nouveau dans les dernières
 30 thèses théologiques de la même année auxquelles il présida.¹¹

[C]

[...] le libelle *in primam Philosophiam Cartesianam Notae, auctore Theophilo Cosmopolita*, imprimé in-XVI^o durant l'été de cette année [1643] sans nom d'imprimeur, sur une copie qu'on feignait avoir été imprimée d'abord à La Haye.¹² L'imposture et la calomnie y régnaient depuis le titre jusqu'à la conclusion du

5 Reference to R/D 46A, ll. 1–5.

6 Baillet is mistaken. The 'renegade monk' is Lambertus vanden Waterlaet. Cf. D/R 42, n. 3.

7 In the passages of the *Lettre apologétique* referred to, Descartes quotes from *Bonae fidei sacrum* (MARESIUS 1646) of Samuel Maresius, in which the Groningen professor of theology attempts to demonstrate Voetius' intellectual authorship of *Admiranda methodus* by publishing numerous documents (AT VIII B 249–250, 260–261). See the notice on *Admiranda methodus* in my commentary on R/D 46.

8 See the previous note.

9 See the notice on *Admiranda methodus* in my commentary on R/D 46.

10 R/D 44.

11 The disputation in question is probably *Appendix ad disputationes De creatione, prima*, defended on 11/21 July 1643, which is the last disputation but two of the academic year 1642–1643. It is explicitly directed against Cartesianism (reprinted in VOETIUS 1648–1669, I, 808–831, see especially 815–816). Voetius warns academic youth, in particular the theological students, against this dangerous philosophy, and it is probably no coincidence that the respondent of the disputation is Cornelis Bruinvisch, a former student and respondent of Regius (see R/D 18, n. 6).

12 See my commentary.

- 5 libelle. L'extravagance du style et la grossièreté des injures dont il était rempli
 ressemblait si fort à celles que M. Regius attribuait à Voetius dans sa classe et ses
 conversations, qu'on peut raisonnablement présumer que de tout ce qui pouvait
 appartenir à Voetius, il n'y avait que son nom de caché dans tout ce libelle, et que
 son esprit s'y produisait par tout. [*I.m.*: Lettr. MSS. 23, 24, de Regius à Descartes.]
- 10 Voetius n'en usait presque plus autrement dans les écrits diffamatoires qu'il avait
 soin de faire répan- | dre contre M. Descartes, souvent sous un nom emprunté, et 205
 quelquefois sous un nom postiche.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet does not give the date of the letters numbered 23 and 24 in the Clerselier collection, but texts B and C each have an indication for the date of the letters. Text B (ll. 29–30) probably refers to a disputation by Voetius defended on 11/21 July 1643. In text C Baillet discusses the pamphlet by Theophilus Cosmopolita, his only source being Regius' letters nos. 23 and 24. The pamphlet's time of publication is not unambiguously clear (see below), but Baillet seems to be right in claiming it appeared in the summer of 1643. I date the letters after 21 July but before September 1643, when the Utrecht Vroedschap turned against Descartes (see below).

Text

See my commentary on R/D 44.

*Context**1. The condemnation of Descartes' Epistola ad Patrem Dinet and Epistola ad Voetium*

After receiving two copies of Descartes' *Epistola ad Voetium*, the Utrecht Vroedschap instituted a formal committee of inquiry.¹³ Its aim was to investigate Descartes' accusations against the Utrecht theologian and minister, in particular those of misconduct, atheism, and the authorship of *Admiranda methodus*. On the first two points, the committee asked testimonies from the Senate and the church council, who naturally gave evidence of Voetius' outstanding reputation and orthodoxy. As regards the alleged authorship of *Admiranda methodus*, Voetius produced a written statement by Schoock claiming to be the sole author of the work.¹⁴ This was enough evidence for the Vroedschap to condemn Descartes' *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* and *Epistola ad Voetium* as defamatory pamphlets on 13/23 September 1643.¹⁵ As these were criminal charges,

¹³ *Resolutiën*, 182–183.

¹⁴ In 1645, however, Schoock retracted the testimony (cf. my commentary on R/D 46).

¹⁵ *Resolutiën*, 185. The text of the condemnation is found in AT IV 20–23.

Descartes was ordered to appear in court. Alarmed, Descartes turned to the Stadholder who personally prevented Descartes from being put on trial.

In 1642, Descartes wrote to Huygens that, in order to get the peace he longed for, he must wage war against Voetius for a while.¹⁶ Descartes attacked Voetius with a plethora of *ad hominem* arguments, more or less expecting the Utrecht Vroedschap to expel Voetius. He had, however, underestimated his opponent and misjudged the political climate in Utrecht and the policy of the Vroedschap. Consequently, the Frenchman's little war resulted in a virulent dispute, and when the Magistrate was forced to intervene, it became a lasting source of frustration for Descartes. He addressed the Vroedschap several times, in 1643 (AT IV 9–12) and in 1645, but to no effect (see my commentary on R/D 55).

2. *Mercurius and Theophilus Cosmopolita*

In the anonymous preface to Descartes' *Notae in programma quoddam* (1648), the pamphlet of "Theophilus Cosmopolita" is attributed to the same author of another pamphlet against Descartes, the *Pentalogos* by a certain "Mercurius Cosmopolita".¹⁷ The *Pentalogos*, published in 1640, is a colloquium between five interlocutors, who discuss Descartes' *Discours* and the *Essais*, one of the participants being the author of the *Discours* himself.¹⁸ The choice of the names of the interlocutors betrays the sympathies of the writer for Hermetic philosophy. According to Descartes, who was very annoyed by the work, the author of the work was 'a Bohemian chemist, living in The Hague'.¹⁹ The work was indeed printed in The Hague at the press of Franck Spruyt.²⁰

Whereas Descartes speaks on various occasions about the *Pentalogos*, he is completely silent on the pamphlet published under the name of Theophilus.²¹ The only reference is found in Regius' correspondence with Descartes, as reported by Baillet (R/D 49C). According to Baillet, the pamphlet was printed in sixteenmo after a copy published in The Hague, and the real author would be Voetius. Now, the apparently only surviving copy of the work is in quarto and counts 23 pages, the title page included. The complete title reads *In primam philosophiam Cartesianam Notae Auctore Theophilo Cosmopolita*; neither the place and the year of publication, nor the publisher are mentioned.²² However, the first line of the pamphlet gives an indication of the date:

16 Descartes to Huygens, 26 April 1642, ROTH 1926, 167/AT III 784.

17 '... Tenebrio quidam ac Lucifuga, qui nunc Theophilum, nunc Mercurium, Cosmopolitam se vocat, in gemino libello, ante aliquot annos edito', AT VIII B 337. The author of the preface is probably Heereboord (cf. VERBEEK 1992A, 58).

18 'Pentalogos inter Hermetis Filium; Appollony Nepotem; Naturalistam gloriosum [Descartes]; Naturam; et Mercurium Naturae Filium', MERCURIUS COSMOPOLITA 1640, title page.

19 '... c'est un Chymiste Boëmien, demeurant à la Haye', Descartes to Mersenne, 3 December 1640, AT III 249/CM X 297–298.

20 An interesting detail is that Spruyt took over the press from Johan Stampioen. KOSSMANN 1937, 365; GRUYS/DE WOLF 1980, 85.

21 Descartes to De Wilhem, 5 October 1640, AT III 201; Descartes to Mersenne, 28 January 1641, AT III 296/CM X 439; 7 December 1642, AT III 598/CM XI 364–365; 4 January 1643, AT III 608/CM XII 2; 23 March 1643, AT III 643/CM XII 107–108; *Epistola ad Voetium*, AT VIII B 189.

22 Bibliothèque nationale de France, R 3545.

the author received a copy of Descartes' *Meditationes* in May 1643.²³

We would have to leave it at that, if Voetius and his son Paulus Voet had not listed the pamphlet in question among anti-Cartesian works. Voetius refers to it as 'an anonymous work in quarto, apparently by a physician, published in The Hague in 1643'.²⁴ His son moreover mentions the publisher: 'an anonymous writing published in quarto by Arnold Meurs'.²⁵ Baillet's information on the place of the original publication seems to be correct. The reference by father and son Voetius makes it unlikely that Voetius is the true author, especially since Voetius refers to the author as 'apparently a physician'. Moreover, the pamphlet shows the same Paracelsist and Hermetic influences as the *Pentalogos*, which supports the claim in the preface of Descartes' *Notae* that both pamphlets have the same author. As regards the reprint reported by Baillet, although no copy of it ever surfaced, it is possible that the pamphlet of Theophilus Cosmopolita was reprinted in Utrecht, with or without Voetius' knowledge.

There may have been another reason for Regius to suspect Voetius' involvement. In 1640, the printer Spruyt published a pamphlet by no one other than the elusive Theophilus Cosmopolita, under the title *In libellum de absoluto reprobationis decreto ... notae*.²⁶ It is a strong defence of the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation and predestination.²⁷ Although the pamphlet appears to have remained completely unnoticed, if Regius knew about it, its dogmatic Reformed character will have reminded him of Voetius' works, thus easily linking Voetius with the pseudonym Theophilus Cosmopolita when a reprint of the anti-Cartesian work appeared in Utrecht. In any case, it is most unlikely that the author of the 1640 pamphlet is the same person as the 1642 brochure.²⁸

23 'Die 20 Maij Anni currentis 1643 oblatu est nobis sub specioso titulo Philosophiae primae libellus', THEOPHILUS COSMOPOLITA 1643, 3.

24 '... Anonymus, professione, uti videtur, Medicus tractatu in 4o Hagae-comitis anno 1643', VOETIUS 1644, 687.

25 '... ab anonymo Hagecomitis apud Arnoldum Meurs in 4o', VOET 1646A, [124]. On Arnoldus Meurs or Aert Meuris, see KOSSMANN 1937, 267–269; GRUYS/DE WOLF 1980, 63.

26 THEOPHILUS COSMOPOLITA 1640.

27 For the discussion in which the pamphlet participates, see GROTIUS 1928–2001, XI, 323, 540. I found no reference to the pamphlet neither in contemporary nor in modern literature.

28 Theophilus Cosmopolita revived in the second half of the 17th century. In 1686 and 1687, during his peregrination along the Dutch universities, the Cartesian Miklos (Nicolaus) Apáti (1662–1724) had two remarkable encounters with a mysterious person who called himself Mercurius Theophilus Cosmopolita. During his conversations with the wanderer, who claimed to speak seven languages, the Hungarian student criticised his belief in the transmigration of souls and an all animated universe. In his account of these meetings (APÁTI 1688, 139–143) Apáti remarks that the person in question had taken his pseudonyms from the preface to Descartes' *Notae in programma quoddam*. On Apáti, see TURÓCZI-TROSTLER 1934, 106–114; TORDAI 1964, 160; TÓTH 1979, 423, 426–428, 437.

Regius to Descartes [Egmond]

[9/] 19 February 1644

Vie, II, 207–208 [A], 215 [B] (no. 27); [C]¹.
AT, IV, 97 [B and C] (no. 340).

[A]

Le langage de M. Regius, qui prétendait que ce gros livre d'*Instances* était | rempli 208
d'aigreurs et d'insultes, était fort opposé à celui de M. Heereboord.² [*i.m.*: Lettr. 27
MS. de Reg. du 19 Février 1644.] Mais pour les concilier, il suffit de remarquer
que l'un parlait de M. Gassendi à M. Gassendi, dans l'intention de captiver sa
5 bienveillance à l'insu de M. Descartes; et que l'autre parlait de M. Gassendi à
M. Descartes pour l'exciter à la vengeance contre un adversaire dont le mérite lui
paraissait fort à craindre pour le succès de leur philosophie.

[B]

M. Regius, qui, quoique séparé d'intérêt depuis quelque temps d'avec M. Descartes
par un consentement mutuel, [*i.m.*: Lettr. 27 MS. de Reg.] pour ne pas se nuire l'un
à l'autre dans l'affaire d'Utrecht, n'était pas moins attaché à lui qu'auparavant, ne
sentait pas moins vivement cet éloignement de son cher maître,³ que s'il eut été
5 question de la séparation de son âme d'avec son corps. M. Descartes qui avait des
raisons particulières pour le détacher peu à peu, [*i.m.*: V. *ibid.* la lettr. du 19 Février

1 The basis of text C is a manuscript note in a copy of Descartes' *Principes de philosophie* (Paris: P. Des-Hayes, 1647), 382–383, kept in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France (Paris). According to Adam and Tannery, on whom I rely, the note is in the hand of one of the annotators of *ExI*.

2 On p. 207, Baillet relates the publication of Gassendi's *Disquisitio metaphysica* (GASSENDI 1644), a response to Descartes' indignant reply to Gassendi's objections (AT VII 256–391). Baillet subsequently reports Heereboord's letter to Gassendi, in which the Leiden professor of philosophy expresses his admiration for the work (25 February 1644, cf. GASSENDI 1658, VI, 465). On the dispute between Descartes and Gassendi, see OSLER 1995 and LENNON 1995. Adriaan Heereboord (1613–1661) studied from 1631 till 1637 at the Statencollege in Leiden. In 1640, he was appointed associate professor of logic at Leiden University, receiving the degree of *magister philosophiae* from Golius in February 1641. In 1644 Heereboord became full professor, his subjects being, from 1645 onwards, logic and ethics. In 1643 and 1644, he held disputations both pro and contra Descartes and Regius (cf. VERBEEK 1992A, 37; THUISSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 107–108), but Descartes records his pro-Cartesianism in a letter to Pollot of 8 January 1644, adding that in his most recent disputations '[Heereboord] s'y declare plus ouvertement pour moy, et me cite avec beaucoup (plus) d'eloges, que n'a iamais fait Mr de Roy' (AT IV 77). Heereboord's staunch defence of the New Philosophy met with serious opposition from the professors of theology Jacob Trigland (1583–1654) and Jacobus Revius (1586–1658), and the professor of philosophy Adam Stuart (1591–1654), which battle resulted in the so-called Leiden Crisis in 1647. On Heereboord and the Leiden Crisis, see DIBON 1954, 116–119; THUISSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 95–107, 114–125; RUESTOW 1973, *passim*; MCGAHAGAN 1976, 217–260; DE DIJN 1983; VERBEEK 1992A, 34–51, 61–70, 78–82.

3 Descartes prepared himself for a stay in France, which lasted from June till November 1644 (cf. my commentary on the date of R/D 51).

1644.] avait pris ses mesures d'assez loin pour le préparer à cet événement, et semblait l'y avoir assez bien disposé par lettres et de vive voix.

[C]

Après le feu de la poudre, qui est l'un de ceux qui durent le moins, considérons si, tout au contraire, il peut y avoir quelque feu qui dure fort long temps, sans avoir besoin de nouvelle matière pour s'entretenir: comme on raconte de certaines lampes qu'on a trouvées ardentes en des tombeaux, lors qu'on les a ouverts après
 5 qu'ils avoient esté fermés plusieurs siècles. [*I.m.*: V. la lettre de M. le Roy a M. Desc. datée du 9 fevrier 1644 cy aprez dans les fragmens.] Je ne veux point estre garent de la verité de telle histoires [...]⁴

COMMENTARY

Date

The date 19 February 1644 is given by Baillet in texts A and B without indication of the calendar used. However, a copy of the French translation of the *Principia* (1647) annotated in the same hands as the *ExI*, has a note which claims that a letter in the Clerselier collection is dated 9 February 1644 (text C).⁵ If it concerns the same letter, its exact date is 9/19 February 1644.

Text

My presentation of R/D 50 differs from AT in two respects. First, I add text A, which is not found in AT. Second, the complete relevant passage from the *Principia* is given (text C) and not just the phrase to which the manuscript note corresponds to ('comme ... siècles').

⁴ AT IXB 262–263. In the Latin edition (1644) the passage reads: 'Post illum ignem, qui omnium minimè durabilis est, consideremus an dari possit aliquis alius, qui è contrà sine ullo alimento diutissimè perseveret: ut narratur de lucernis quibusdam, quae aliquando in hypogaeis, ubi mortuorum corpora servabantur, post multos annos inventae sunt accensae' (AT VIII A 266). Note the additional disclaimer in the French edition. The reference to Regius' letter seems to indicate that Descartes and Regius discussed the topic in their correspondence. The anecdote is rooted in the common 17th century belief that the Romans provided their dead with eternally burning lamps, some of which were said to have been found still burning after 1000 years (on which subject see LICETUS 1653; cf. BRUNSTING 1973, 11–12).

⁵ Cf. AT IV 97.

51
Regius to Descartes [Leiden¹]
4 June 1644

Vie, II, 215–216 (no. 30).
AT, IV, 124 (no. 350–I).

(In continuation of R/D 50C)

Néanmoins toute la philosophie ne fut point | capable de lui [Regius] inspirer la 216
constance nécessaire pour supporter cette séparation, dont il nous a décrit la peine,
en des termes d'autant plus touchants,² qu'il semblait moins se fier à la promesse
qu'il lui avait faite de revenir en Hollande. Après lui avoir présenté [*i.m.*: Lettr. 30
5 MS. de Reg. du 4 Juin.] les vœux de sa femme, de sa fille, de M. le Baron de
Haestrecht,³ de M. le Conseiller Van Leeuw,⁴ de M. Parmentier,⁵ et de M. Van
Dam,⁶ célèbre médecin d'Utrecht, dans sa lettre d'adieu, il lui protesta que sans
les engagements qui le liaient avec sa femme, ses enfants et sa profession, il le
suivrait partout, et s'attacherait à sa personne de la manière qu'il espérait l'être à
10 son cœur pour toute sa vie. Enfin, il le conjura de vouloir adoucir les rigueurs de
la nécessité qui le retenait, en continuant, quelque part qu'il fût, de l'assister de
ses conseils et de ses instructions.

1 According to Baillet, Descartes left Egmond aan de Hoef on May 1 and went to Leiden (*Vie*, II, 211–212/AT IV 108). It is not entirely clear whether he subsequently moved to The Hague, where his presence is attested by Sorbière, or only visited the city for a couple of days (cf. Sorbière to Gassendi, 10 May 1644, GASSENDI 1658, VI, 469/AT IV 109/CM XIII 113). Descartes embarked for France in mid-June (see my commentary).

2 Cf. R/D 50B.

3 See the *Biographical Lexicon*.

4 Cf. D/R 31, n. 19.

5 Anthony Charles Parmentier (c.1603–1666) studied philosophy in Leiden (matr. 1623), and went abroad to study in Geneva and Siena (1628). He was Lord of Heeswijk and Achthoven, member of the States of Utrecht, and Dean of the Chapter of Oudmunster in Utrecht. In June 1631, occupying the position of *Raadpensionaris* in Nijmegen, he married Elisabeth Vivien in Cologne. He returned to Utrecht before 1640, because two of his children were baptised there in 1640 and 1642. STELLING- MICHAUD 1959–1980, V, 89; DTB, Utrecht Archives.

6 Probably Peter van Dam (c.1594–1663), who was appointed, together with Regius, town physician of Utrecht on 25 September 1637 OS (DE VRIJER 1917, 9). In 1610 he matriculated at Leiden University, and in 1613 he studied at the famous Faculty of Medicine in Padua as well (*Alb. Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 98; POELHEKKE 1961, 314). In 1617 he became an alderman (*schepen*) in his hometown, Amersfoort, but being a Remonstrant, his appointment was not prolonged in 1619. He took up lodgings in Utrecht, where he accommodated the Remonstrant theologian Conrad Vorstius for some time. Around 1622 he left for Friedrichsstadt a/d Eider, where the Remonstrants had founded a community, but he returned to Utrecht before 1629 (NNBW, I, 681). A year after the death of his first wife, Christina Peut, who probably fell a victim to the plague in 1636, he remarried Henrica Ploos van Amstel. He was canon and *rentmeester* of St Paul's abbey in Utrecht (DTB, GAU).

4 June 1644

R/D 51

COMMENTARY

Date

The date is given by Baillet. We have no clear indication of the calendar used, but if Descartes embarked for France in mid-June 1644 — Baillet reports that he arrived in Paris towards the end of June (*Vie* — II, 217), it needs to be the Gregorian calendar, as a letter written on 4/14 June would have run the risk of arriving too late.⁷

Text

In AT, R/D 51 and R/D 52 are taken together for no apparent reason (AT no. 350). The separation of the letters poses no particular problem, and I therefore list each letter as a single item.

⁷ Baillet gives two indications for Descartes' departure: 1. 'M. Descartes n'arrivera à Paris que vers la fin du mois de Juin' (*Vie*, II, 217); 2. 'Cette mort [of Bannius] était survenue environ six semaines après son départ de Hollande' (*Vie*, II, 248). The Catholic priest and musical theorist Joan Albert Bannius or Ban (1597–1644) died on 27 July (NNBW, VIII, 44–46). Baillet's source for Bannius' death is probably Huygens' letter to Mersenne, dated 16 August 1644 (CM XIII 196), which letter Baillet knew (cf. *Vie*, II, 248). Bannius' correspondence with Mersenne and Huygens is found in CM, vols. VII–XII, and HUYGENS 1911–1917, vols. II–III.

Regius to Descartes [Paris¹]
[late July or August 1644]

Vie, II, 216 [A], 228 [B] (no. 31).
AT, IV, 124 [A] (no. 350–II), 149 [B, partly].

[A] (In continuation of R/D 51)

La belle saison s’avançait, sans que l’imprimeur et le graveur des figures pussent finir. [*i.m.*: Pag. 106 du 3 vol. des lettr. *initio*.²] M. Descartes, pour ne point laisser perdre les commodités du voyage qui se présentaient, se vit obligé de partir les mains vides, après s’être assuré [*i.m.*: Lipstorp. pag. 84.³] de l’affection et
5 de l’industrie de M. Schooten, Professeur des mathématiques à Leyde, qui s’était chargé des figures, et avoir laissé la liste de ses amis de Hollande, pour qui il ordonnait les présents de son livre.⁴ [*i.m.*: Lettr. 31 MS. de Reg. à Desc.] Avant que de s’embarquer en Zélande, il vit en passant le sieur Jean de Beverwick⁵
10 [*i.m.*: né en 1594], dit *Beverovicus*, Gentilhomme de Dordrecht, Conseiller et Médecin ordinaire de cette ville, qui faisait imprimer actuellement à Rotterdam, pour la quatrième édition, le Recueil [*i.m.*: De Termino fatali] de ses questions épistolaires, enrichi d’un grand nombre de pièces nouvelles, dont la principale était celle qui contenait le sentiment de M. Descartes sur la circulation du sang.⁶

-
- 1 Regius probably addressed his letter to Descartes’ host in Paris, Claude Picot, in the Rue des Ecouffles (cf. Descartes to Picot, 2 May 1644, AT IV 108).
- 2 ‘Il y a deux mois que les Principes de ma Philosophie eussent dû être achevés d’imprimeur, si le libraire m’eût tenu parole; mais il a été retardé par les figures, qu’il n’a pu faire tailler si tôt qu’il pensait. J’espère pourtant de vous les envoyer bientôt, si le vent ne m’emporte d’ici, avant qu’ils soient achevés’, Descartes to P. [Grandamy ?], [2 May 1644], CLE III, 106/AT IV 122–123.
- 3 In the passage referred to, Daniel Lipstorp (1631–1684) praises the work of Frans van Schooten Jr (1615–1660), who drew the figures for Descartes’ *Principia* (printed by L. Elsevier) and the simultaneous Latin edition of *Dioptrique* and *Météores*, and, by literally illustrating the philosophy of Descartes, did much for the dissemination of Cartesianism (LIPSTORP 1653, 84). Van Schooten also edited the Latin edition of the *Géométrie* (Leiden: J. Maire, 1649). NNBW, VII, 1110–1114.
- 4 The *Principia* appeared on 10 July 1644 (AT VIII A 350). Van Surck took care of its distribution among Descartes’ friends in July and August, cf. Elizabeth to Descartes, 1 August 1644, AT IV 131–133; Huygens to Mersenne, 16 August 1644, AT IV 133/CM XIII 195; Van Surck to Huygens, 30 August 1644, AT IV 134/HUYGENS 1911–1917, IV 54.
- 5 On Johan van Beverwijck, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.
- 6 See my commentary on R/D 11, n. 11. Baillet is the only one to report Descartes’ visit to Van Beverwijck; there is no independent evidence of that the two ever met. It is possible that Baillet found the information in Regius’ letter.

[B]

Mais on peut dire à la gloire de la vérité à laquelle M. Descartes a toujours été disposé de tout sacrifier, que de toutes les choses qu'il a expliquées, [*i.m.*: Num. 205. part. 4. Princip.⁷] il n'y en a point qui ne paraissent au moins moralement certaines par rapport à l'usage de la vie, quoi qu'elles soient incertaines par rapport à la puissance absolue de Dieu. [*i.m.*: Lettr. MS. 31 de Reg.] Ceux qui considéreront l'adresse avec laquelle il [Descartes] rappelle à un fort petit nombre de principes clairs et intelligibles une multitude presque infinie de choses très-cachées, quand même ils croiraient qu'il n'aurait posé ces principes que par hasard et sans raison, ne laisseront pas de reconnaître qu'il n'est presque pas possible que tant de choses pussent se trouver si naturellement suivies et si heureusement liées, si les principes d'où elles sont déduites étaient faux.

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet does not mention the date of letter no. 31 in the Clerselier collection, but as it concerns a letter of thanks upon receiving a copy of Descartes' *Principia*, we can place it in late July or August 1644. The *Principia* left the printing office on 10 July (cf. AT VI 1), and was distributed among Descartes' friends in the Netherlands by Van Surck in July and August 1644.⁸

Text

Although Adam and Tannery take R/D 51 and R/D 52 together, I list them as separate items (see my commentary on R/D 51). As for text B, Adam and Tannery only printed the selection's second sentence, thereby omitting the reference to the *Principia*. Because the second sentence is nothing but a paraphrase of the passage in the *Principia* referred to in the first sentence, I incorporate the complete paragraph from *Vie* to point this out.

⁷ Text B is nothing but a free rendering of the first and the last sentence of the text mentioned; it is not clear what the reference to R/D 52 in text B amounts to. Possibly, Regius cited the article's conclusion with approval. *Principia*, IV, art. 205: 'Sed tamen, ne qua hic veritati fraus fiat, considerandum est quaedam esse quae habentur certa moraliter, hoc est, quantum sufficit ad usum vitae, quamvis si ad absolutam Dei potentiam referantur, sint incerta. [...] Sed qui advertent quam multa de magnetete, de igne, de totius Mundi fabrica, ex paucis quibusdam principiis hic deducta sint, quamvis ista principia tantum casu et sine ratione a me assumpta esse putarent, forte tamen agnoscent, vix potuisse contingere, ut tam multa simul cohaerent, si falsa essent', AT VIII A 327–328.

⁸ Cf. n. 4.

Vie, II, 248–249.

AT, IV, 148–149 (no. 361–I).

[*I.m.*: Tom. 3 des lettr. pag. 111. item 394.¹] M. Descartes alla droit en Nord-Hollande se retirer à Egmond de Binnen,² dans la résolution de se renfermer plus | 249
 profondément que jamais au fonds de son ancienne solitude, et de s'appliquer, loin
 des importunités de ses voisins et des visites de ses amis, à la connaissance des
 5 animaux, des plantes, et des minéraux. Cependant ses amis d'Utrecht étaient en-
 core dans de grandes inquiétudes pour son passage, depuis les fâcheuses nouvelles
 qu'ils en avaient reçues de Calais.³ Plusieurs se trouvèrent le XVII de Novembre
 chez M. de Haestrecht, où M. Regius s'était rendu à la compagnie d'un Gen-
 tilhomme fort qualifié et fort ami de M. Descartes, nommé *Antoine Studler van*
 10 *Zureck*, seigneur de Berghen en Kennemerlandt, à qui M. Descartes avait coutume
 de faire ses emprunts pour l'argent dont il avait besoin.⁴ Pendant que l'on discourait
 des dangers de son voyage, plus ou moins grands par mer ou par terre, ils virent
 arriver un autre Gentilhomme nommé *Cornelis van Hooghelande*, [*i.m.*: Ce Gen-
 tilhomme faisait des remèdes.] qui venait visiter M. de Haestrecht et le soulager de
 15 ses incommodités de la pierre par ses remèdes, et par l'heureuse nouvelle du retour
 de leur ami.⁵ Il se montra aussi à propos *que le Dieu qui sort de la machine*, pour
 délivrer la compagnie de ses inquiétudes. Il leur fit voir une lettre de la main de
 M. Descartes, qui changea leurs appréhensions en une joie toute extraordinaire.⁶

1 'J'estois allé, cét esté, en France pour mes affaires domestiques; mais, les ayant promptement terminées, ie suis revenu en ces païs de Hollande, où toutesfois aucune raison ne me retient, sinon que i'y puis vacquer plus commodement à mes divertissemens d'estude, pource que la coustume de ce païs ne porte pas qu'on s'entrevise si librement qu'on fait en France', Descartes to [Dinet], [9 February 1645 ?], CLE III, 111/AT IV 159–160. The second reference concerns another eulogy on the tranquillity in North-Holland (Descartes to Mersenne, 27 May 1638, CLE III, 394/AT II 151–152/CM VII 241).

2 Descartes disembarked at Dordrecht on 12 or 13 November 1644 (Descartes, from Dordrecht, to Huygens, 13 November 1644, ROTH 1926, 233/AT IV 773). In December he went looking for new lodgings in the Egmond area, finally settling at Egmond-Binnen (cf. Descartes to Huygens, 21 December 1644, ROTH 1926, 234/AT IV 774).

3 According to Baillet, bad weather conditions detained Descartes, who was on his journey back to the Netherlands, in Calais for a fortnight in early November 1644 (*Vie*, II, 247, referring to a letter of Descartes to Picot from Calais of 8 November 1644, cf. AT IV 147). On Thursday-evening 10 November Descartes was still in Calais (cf. COHEN 1920, 585; AT IV 725–726; BOTS/VAN GEMERT/RIETBERGEN 1975, 30, 131; to Huygens, 13 November 1644, ROTH 1926, 233/AT IV 773).

4 For Van Haestrecht and Van Surck, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

5 For Cornelis van Hogelande, see the *Biographical Lexicon*.

6 The letter in question is lost.

20 M. Regius en porta aussitôt la nouvelle à tous leurs amis de la ville,⁷ et il écrivit dès le lendemain [*i.m.*: Lett. MS. de Reg. du 18 Novembre 1644.] une lettre de commune réjouissance en leur nom à M. Descartes. Elle était remplie de vœux, pour demander au ciel qu'il ne les exposât plus au danger de perdre le bien qu'ils venaient de recouvrer; et que celui qu'ils appelaient *la lumière éclatante de leur pais* ne cessât plus de les éclairer. La lettre fut adressée à M. de Hooghlandt [...].⁸

COMMENTARY

Date

On 17 November 1644 Regius and Van Surck visited Van Haestrecht, where they discussed the perils Descartes would face during his voyage from France to the Netherlands.⁹ Like a *deus ex machina*, Van Hogelande arrived informing them of Descartes' safe return to Holland. Descartes disembarked at Dordrecht on 12 or 13 November, and the date of the meeting is therefore probably 17 November NS. According to Baillet, Regius sent the letter via Van Hogelande the day after the latter came to Utrecht, and the letter consequently dates from 18 November (NS).

Baillet does not supply the number of the letter in the Clerselier collection, but De Vrijer's conclusion that it was not part of the collection is unfounded (DE VRIJER 1917, 147). Baillet gives the date of several other letters without mentioning their number in the collection (cf. R/D 3, R/D 4, and R/D 11). According to Adam and Tannery R/D 53 must be either number 31 or 32 (AT IV 149), which is incorrect, because no. 32 dates from 1645 (R/D 55), and the purpose of no. 31 (R/D 52) — a letter of thanks upon receiving a copy of the *Principia* — is out of line with the contents of the present letter.

Text

Deleted from the selection in AT: 'M. Descartes à son arrivée en Hollande, qui fut le XV du mois de Novembre, apprit de M. Bloemaert la mort de leur intime ami le sieur Jean Albert Bannius, Prêtre de Harlem' (*Vie*, II, 248). There is no reference to Regius' letter, and, moreover, Baillet is mistaken both as to the date Descartes arrived in Holland, and as to the moment he learned about the death of Bannius (cf. R/D 51, n. 7).

⁷ Cf. R/D 51, ll. 5–7.

⁸ Cf. R/D 54B.

⁹ Descartes travelled to France in June 1644 (see my commentary on the date of R/D 51).

Regius to Van Hogelande [Leiden]

[8/] 18 November 1644

Vie, II, 38 [A], 249 [B] (no. 37).
 AT, IV, 149 [B] (no. 361–II).

[A]

[*I.m.*: Let. 37 MS. de Reg. à Hoogland.] M. Regius [...] vengea son maître d'une manière qui fit apparemment ouvrir les yeux à Plempius, puisqu'il changea son sentiment sur la circulation du sang pour embrasser celui de M. Descartes.¹

[B] (In continuation of R/D 53)

La lettre² fut adressée à M. de Hooghlandt avec une belle réponse à celle [*i.m.*: Lett. MS. 37 de Reg. à Hooghelande du 18 Novembre 1644.] que ce Gentilhomme avait écrite en particulier à M. Regius, qu'il ne croyait pas devoir trouver chez M. de Haestrecht.³

COMMENTARY

Date

Baillet gives the date of the letter, 18 November 1644, without indication of the calendar used, but it probably is New Style (see my commentary on R/D 53).

Text

Text A is not found in AT.

1 In R/D 54, Regius apparently pointed out that, due to his attack on Plemp, the Leuven professor of medicine published his correspondence with Descartes in full in the second edition of *Fundamenta medicinae* (PLEMPIUS 1644), and, moreover, accepted the Harveian theory on blood circulation (cf. R/D 11B; D/R 13, ll. 42–45; REGIUS 1640A, [5]/AT III 732).

2 R/D 53.

3 Probably a short note to inform Regius of Descartes' return to the Netherlands.

Regius to Descartes [Egmond]

[13/] 23 June 1645

ExI, III (MS 4471), 1 [A]; *Vie*, II, 210–211 [B] (no. 32).
AT, IV, 235 (no. 385).

[A]

[...] M. le Roy l'a recue a Utrecht le 22 Juin 1645.¹ Voyez la 32e lettre des Ms de Regius a D(escartes), datée du 23 juin 1645, où on lit ces paroles: *Hesterno mane fasciculum tuarum chartarum accepi*, etc., et dans une note marginale, M. Clerselier a mis ces paroles: *Fasciculus ille est eius defensio contra Voetium*;
5 et il a grande raison d'en juger ainsi, car la suite de la même lettre de Regius à Descartes le manifeste clairement.²

[B]

M. de Sorbière ne réussissait point mal à brouiller de plus en plus M. Descartes avec M. Gassendi. Il avait grand soin de mander à celui-ci tous les miracles que son livre opérait dans les Provinces Unies contre la secte du cartésianisme. [*L.m.*: Pag. 470. tom. 6. op. Gassend.³] Il n'oublia point sur tout la conversion du
5 prédicateur de la Reine de Bohème Electrice Palatine, nommé le sieur Samson Jonsson,⁴ qui était cartésien outré avant la lecture de la *Disquisition* de M. Gassendi*. [*L.m.*: * C'est dommage que Samson Jonsson fût relaps, et qu'il retourna au

1 The first item in Clerselier's third volume of Descartes' correspondence is the *Lettre apologétique*. The note on a separate leaflet in *ExI* erroneously claims that Regius received the *Lettre apologétique* in June 1645 (see n. 2).

2 Emphasis added. It is generally thought that the *fasciculus* in question is Descartes' *Lettre apologétique*, which is impossible, because that text was written in 1647 (see DESCARTES 1996, 36–41; BOS 1999B). The *fasciculus* is without a doubt connected with Descartes' letter to the Utrecht magistrates of 16 June 1645, which the Vroedschap received on 13/23 June (*Resolutiën*, 219). Regius either received a copy of the relevant pieces in Descartes' missive to the Vroedschap, for which see my commentary, or Descartes sent Regius the original items with the request to hand them over to the magistrates.

3 '... Samsono illi Ionssono Serenissimae Reginae Bohemiae concionatori, qui cum ante lectam Disquisitionem tuam esset Cartesianis dogmatis addictissimus, nunc saepius coram me pronunciat, enervatas à te omninò demonstrationes Cartesij', Sorbière to Gassendi, 10 May 1644, GASSENDI 1658, VI, 470.

4 Samson Johnson (or Sampson/Samuel Jonsson, 1603–1661), since 1638 chaplain to Elizabeth Stuart (1596–1662), Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia. Suspected Socinian, he was dismissed in 1644. From 1646 till 1653 Johnson was a minister serving the Breda garrison church (SPRUNGER 1982, 145, 151–152, 154, 269, 272–273, 335; HOBBS 1994, I, 129–130). The assertion of Descartes and Baillet (AT IV 497; *Vie*, II, 290) that he was professor at the Illustrious School in Breda is incorrect (SASSEN 1962, 44). In 1646 Johnson assisted Regius in obtaining permission to dedicate *Fundamenta physices* to the Stadholder, see Regius to Huygens, 1 September 1646, and Huygens to Johnson, 27 September 1646, HUYGENS 1911–1917, IV, 346, 354 (cf. DE VRIJER 1917, 160, 163). On Regius' English contacts, see my Introduction, xviii, n. 16.

cartésianisme dès l'année suivante. V. le tom. i. des lettr. de Desc. pag. 75.⁵
 V. aussi la lettr. MS. 32 de Regius touchant Jonsson.] De sorte que selon lui les
 10 Méditations de M. Descartes étaient coulées à fonds, et qu'il serait obligé d'en
 faire de nouvelles, s'il continuait dans la pensée d'établir une secte. [...] | Bornius⁶ 211
 se mêlant de faire imprimer le plus qu'il pouvait des ouvrages de M. Gassendi
 en Hollande, n'était pas moins ardent à lui faire savoir le mal qu'il entendait dire
 de M. Descartes dans ces Provinces; et qu'il lui manda un jour que l'on ne disait
 15 plus ni bien ni mal de ses Méditations en Hollande, et que sa réfutation en avait
 fait disparaître les panégyristes. [*i.m.*: Pag. 480 et 489. tom. 6. op. Gass.⁷] Si
 nous en croyons cet auteur, rien n'était plus décrié dans ce pays que cet ouvrage
 de M. Descartes, depuis qu'on y avait vu celui de M. Gassendi. Les disciples*
 [*i.m.*: *Regii Epist. Ms. ad Cartes.⁸] de M. Descartes en étaient alarmés; [*i.m.*:
 20 Pag. 480. op. Gass. *ibid.*] et sur les instances qu'ils lui faisaient de vouloir pour
 l'amour de la philosophie réfuter incessamment cet écrit, [*i.m.*: Item.] il s'était
 contenté de leur dire froidement que M. Gassendi n'avait pas pris sa pensée; que
 son gros livre ne méritait aucune réponse; qu'il pourrait néanmoins en toucher un
 mot en leur considération dans l'édition que l'on faisait de ses Principes, et que
 25 sur le peu qu'il en dirait un enfant de cinq ans serait capable de résoudre les plus
 grosses difficultés de M. Gassendi.

25 résoudre] soudre *Vie*

- 5 'I'ay beaucoup d'obligation à vostre Altesse, de ce qu'il luy a plû me mander son sentiment du livre de
 Monsieur le Chevalier d'Igby, lequel ie ne seray point capable de lire, iusqu'à ce qu'on l'ait traduit en
 Latin; ce que Monsieur Io(n)son, qui estoit hier icy, m'a dit que quelques-uns veulent faire. Il m'a dit aussi
 que ie pouvois adresser mes lettres pour vostre Altesse par les Messagers ordinaires, ce que ie n'eusse osé
 faire sans luy [...]', Descartes to Elizabeth, [early June 1645], CLE I 75/AT IV 221. The work referred to
 is *Two treatises in the one of which the nature of bodies, in the other the nature of man's soul is looked into*
in way of discovery of the immortality of reasonable soules, Paris: G. Blaizot, 1644, by Kenelm Digby
 (1603–1665). Johnson offered to translate two chapters, in which Digby polemicizes with Descartes (see
 Elizabeth to Descartes, 24 May 1644, AT IV 210). Cf. THUISSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 188–195; for Digby, see
 HOBBS 1994, II, 828–832 and DBPh, I, 258–261.
- 6 Henricus Bornius (c. 1617–1675) studied in his hometown Utrecht, in Leiden (1635–1636, 1644; graduation
 in philosophy in 1646) and in Geneva from 1639 till 1641 (*Resolutiën*, 156–157; *Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-*
Bat., 270, 281, 347; MOLHUYSEN 1913–1924, II, 302; STELLING-MICHAUD 1959–1980, II, 276). He was
 an admirer of Gassendi, whom he appears to have met personally before starting a correspondence with
 him (see GASSENDI 1658, VI). In 1646, he was appointed professor of philosophy at the Illustrious School
 of Breda, which chair he exchanged for a professorship *extra ordinem* in ethics at Leiden University in
 1653. He professed himself to be an eclectic and rejected Cartesian philosophy. NNBW, III, 147–149;
 SASSEN 1962, 16–32, 69–91.
- 7 Bornius to Gassendi, 20 September 1644, and 16/26 June 1645, GASSENDI 1658, VI, 480, 489; the relevant
 passages from these letters are also found in AT IV 146; AT IV 238. The latter letter informs us that Regius
 had recently visited Descartes: 'De responsione ad tuam [*Disquisitio metaphysica*] ne verbum quidem
 amplius loquitur. Dominus Regius, Vir Summus in Physicis, ante dies aliquot ipsum salutatum ivit, qui
 petiit ab illo ut vellet scriptum tuum refutare: se certum esse, quod si demonstrare posset rationes tuas
 nullius esse momenti, magnam famae illius partem additum iri. Verum dixit sibi ad illud non satis iam
 esse otij, seque aliis, iisque praestantioribus, curis occupatum esse'. Presumably, Regius visited Descartes
 during the Whitsun holiday, which lasted from 22 May till 28 May OS.
- 8 The reference is probably to the same letter in the Clerselier collection as above, viz. no. 32.

COMMENTARY

Date

While Baillet and the second hand in the *ExI* give 23 June as the date of the letter, the *ExI*'s first hand dates it 13 June, which suggests that the exact date is 13/23 June.⁹ The records of the Utrecht municipality confirm this date, as they register Descartes' letter to the Vroedschap on 13/23 June, which letter is closely connected to the *fasciculus* Regius received a day earlier (text A, ll. 2–3).¹⁰

Text

Adam and Tannery mention Baillet's references to no. 32 of the Clerselier collection (cf. AT IV 149–150, 235), but refrain from giving the actual text in *Vie* (text B).

*Context**Descartes and the Utrecht Vroedschap 1645–1648*

In June 1645, Descartes sent the Utrecht magistrates several documents to prove they had wrongly condemned his open letters to Dinet and Voetius.¹¹ These documents consisted of a testimony by Schoock stating that Voetius was the main author of the *Admiranda methodus*, and there were copies of five letters from Voetius to Mersenne, in which Voetius had asked the learned Minim to refute Descartes's philosophy.¹² The file was accompanied by a personal letter of Descartes, in which he justifies himself and expounds the reasons why the Vroedschap should restore his reputation and give him satisfaction for the insults he suffered from the city.¹³ However, by the time the Vroedschap received Descartes' documents, they already knew about the Groningen judgement and to prevent new unrest they forbade any publication pro or contra Descartes.¹⁴ The Vroedschap ordered its secretary to translate Descartes' letter to allow the affair to peter out. Indeed, the secretary never reported back.¹⁵

9 See my Introduction, *xli*.

10 'Gelesen een Latijnsche missive van Des Cartes aen Burgemeesteren ende Vroetschap deser Stadt, gedateert t'Egmond den xvten deser, *stilo novo*, die den Secretaris is gelast te translateren', *Resolutiën*, 219.

11 See my commentary on R/D 49, *Context 1*.

12 On 17 February 1645, Descartes wrote a letter of complaint to the Senate of Groningen University, demanding satisfaction for the insults of Schoock in *Admiranda methodus* (AT IV 177–179). On 10/20 April 1645, Schoock confessed to the Senate that not he but Voetius had been the real author of the book. The Groningen judgement together with Schoock's testimony can be found in ROTH 1926, 299–306/AT IV 792–799.

13 'Il y a quelque tems que j'envoyay la copie de ces papiers de Groningue à Messieurs du Vroetschap d'Utrecht, et aussy celle de cinq lettres que Voetius a escrites au Pere Mercenne, dans lesquelles il a medit de moy, avant que j'eusse iamais rien escrit contre luy; à quoy j'adioustay une lettre que ie leur adressois, pour me iustifier, et leur faire entendre les raisons pour lesquelles ils me sembloient estre obligez à faire quelque reparation des affronts que j'ay receus de leur ville ...'. Descartes to Huygens, 4 August 1645, AT IV 261/ROTH 1926, 241. For the correspondence of Voetius and Mersenne, see CM IX, 69–73; X, 163–166; XI, 372–377; cf. R/D 5, n. 13.

14 'De Vroetschap interdiceert ende verbiedt wel scherpelick de Boeckdruckers ende Boeckvercopers binnen dese Stadt ende de vrijheyt van dien te drucken oft te doen drucken, mitsgaders te vercopen oft doen vercopen eenige boeckkens oft geschriften *pro* of *contra* Des Cartes', 2/12 June 1645, *Resolutiën*, 218.

15 Cf. n. 10 above.

In a final attempt to obtain justice, Descartes wrote the *Lettre apologétique* and submitted it to the Utrecht Vroedschap in February 1648, together with a Dutch translation.¹⁶ The Vroedschap, however, took note of the *Lettre apologétique* and did not reply.¹⁷

¹⁶ AT VIII B 201–317; DESCARTES 1996.

¹⁷ For the quarrels between Descartes, Schoock and Voetius in 1645–1648, and the history of the *Lettre apologétique*, see VERBEEK 1992A, 29–33; DESCARTES 1996, 3–41; BOS 1999A; BOS 1999B.

Vie, II, 268–269 (no. 33).
AT, IV, 241–242 (no. 388).

M. Regius [*i.m.*: Lettr. 33 MS. de Reg. du 6 Juillet 1645.] qui avait déjà pris son parti, et qui s'était fortifié contre toutes sortes de remontrances, ne laissa point de remercier M. Descartes de ses avis; mais au lieu de les suivre comme auparavant, il se mit en devoir d'excuser son ouvrage, et d'en faire voir l'économie et les beautés
5 à son maître, comme si ces choses eussent échappé à ses réflexions.¹ Il lui fit valoir surtout sa méthode d'analyse, et sa belle ma- | nière de définir et de diviser. Il lui
promit seulement de remédier à quelques obscurités, quoiqu'elles pussent servir à
assujettir davantage un lecteur, et à le rendre plus attentif aux difficultés. Et pour
éviter les inconvénients dont M. Descartes l'avait averti, il lui envoya ce modèle
10 d'avertissement au lecteur, pour être mis au bout de sa préface:

« Pour détromper ceux qui s'imagineraient que les choses qui sont
contenues dans cet ouvrage seraient les sentiments purs de M. Descartes,
je suis bien aise d'avertir le public qu'il y a effectivement plusieurs en-
droits où je fais profession de suivre les opinions de cet excellent homme;
15 mais qu'il y en a aussi d'autres où je suis d'une opinion contraire, et
d'autres encore sur lesquels il n'a pas jugé à propos de s'expliquer
jusqu'ici. C'est ce qu'il sera aisé de remarquer à tous ceux qui prendront la peine de lire les écrits de ce grand homme, et de les confronter avec les miens. »²

¹¹ Pour ... *no new paragraph in Vie*

¹ Regius' 'ouvrage' (l. 4) is an early version of his *Fundamenta physices* (REGIUS 1646). In the present letter Regius reacts to Descartes' first impression of the work. However, the letter in which Descartes wrote down his initial remarks is not found among the letters published by Clerselier. It should be kept in mind that Baillet erroneously assumes that in the present letter Regius replies to D/R 17 (see my commentary on D/R 17).

² When *Fundamenta physices* finally appeared in September 1646, Regius did not include the text he proposes in the present letter in his preface. Nevertheless, in his dedication to the Stadholder Frederik Hendrik (dated 10 August 1646 OS) he acknowledged his debt to the 'incomparable philosopher René Descartes': 'Si verò vestigiis Viri Nobilissimi, et verè Incomparabilis Philosophi, Renati des Cartes, insistent, vel propria sectans, vel aliâ viâ procedens, à vulgaribus quorundam opinionibus, eam solam ob causam, quòd principiis, quae occulta et à se non intellecta fatentur, ac proinde nil nisi cimmericas tenebras, loco quaesitae lucis, exhibere possunt, tanquam ruinosis tibicinibus innitantur, hinc pro libertate Philosophica, quae jubet, ut *Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri* [Horace, *Epistulae*, 1, 1, 14], *Quid verum atque decens curem, et rogem, et omnis in hoc sim* [Horace, *Epistulae*, 1, 1, 11], nonnihil recessero; antiquissimae et charissimae veritatis amor, aliosque juvandi studium, mihi justam, apud aequos rerum aestimatores, excusationem, ut spero, invenient.' (REGIUS 1646, (a)2 verso–(a)3 recto). For the history of *Fundamenta physices*, see VERBEEK 1994.

- 20 Pour tâcher de prévenir le désaveu public dont il croyait que M. Descartes le menaçait, il lui fit offre d'ajouter encore, dans sa préface, tout ce qu'il jugerait à propos, parce qu'il appréhendait ce désaveu comme une réfutation de son ouvrage, capable de l'étouffer, ou de le décrier dans sa naissance. Mais il ne parla point de retoucher au fond de son ouvrage.

COMMENTARY

Date

The date of the letter, 6 July 1645, is found in Baillet and in the *ExI*. The calendar used cannot be determined with certainty, but as both hands in the *ExI* give the same date, it probably concerns the Gregorian calendar.³

20 Pour ... *no new paragraph in Vie*

3 See my Introduction, § 2.3.1.

57
Descartes [Egmond] to Regius
[July 1645]

CLE, I, 430–431 (no. 97).
AT, IV, 248–250 (no. 391).
AM, VI, 262–266; RL, 130–134; CSMK, 254–255; B, 243–245.

Vir Clarissime,

Cum superiores litteras ad te misi,¹ paucas tantum libri tui paginas per-
volveram, et in iis satis causae putabam me invenisse, ad iudicandum
modum scribendi, quo usus es, nullibi, nisi forte in Thesibus, posse pro-
5 bari, in quibus scilicet moris est, opiniones suas modo quam maximè
paradoxo proponere, ut tanto magis alij alliciantur ad eas oppugnandas.
Sed quantum ad me, nihil mihi magis vitandum puto, quam ne opiniones
meae paradoxae videantur, atque ipsas nunquam in disputationibus ag-
itari velim, sed tam certas evidentesque esse confido, ut illis à quibus
10 rectè intelligantur, omnem disputandi occasionem sint sublaturae. Fa-
teor quidem eas per definitiones et divisiones, à generalibus ad particu-
laria procedendo, rectè tradi posse, atqui nego probationes debere tunc
obmitti; scio tamen illas vobis adultioribus, et in meâ doctrinâ satis ver-
satis, non esse necessarias. Sed considera, quaeso, quam pauci sint illi
15 adultiores, cum ex multis Philosophantium millibus vix unus reperiatur
qui eas intelligat; et sanè qui probationes intelligunt, assertiones etiam
non ignorant, ideòque scripto tuo non indigent. Alij autem legentes as-
sertiones sine probationibus, variasque definitiones planè paradoxas, in
quibus globulorum aethereorum, aliarumque similium rerum, nullibi à
20 te explicatarum, mentionem facis, eas irridebunt et contemnent, sicque
tuum scriptum nocere saepius poterit, prodesse nunquam.

Haec | sunt quae, lectis prioribus scripti tui paginis, iudicavi. Sed 431
cum ad caput de Homine² perveni, atque ibi vidi quae de Mente hu-

22 Haec ... *no new paragraph in CLE*

1 The previous letter meant here may have been the covering note to a copy of Descartes' letter to the Utrecht magistrates, which Descartes sent to Regius in late June 1645 (see R/D 55A). In any case, Descartes' only remark on Regius' work in the previous letter seems to have been that, after glancing through the first pages, he disliked Regius' way of presentation, something which he repeats more elaborately in the present letter. For Descartes' similar criticism in an earlier stage, see D/R 17, which letter Baillet, as well as Adam and Tannery, erroneously, consider to be the previous letter mentioned (cf. my commentary on D/R 17).

2 The last of the twelve chapters in *Fundamenta physices*.

mana et de Deo habes,³ non modo in priore sententia fui confirmatus,
 25 sed insuper planè obstupui et indolui, tum quod talia credere videaris,
 tum quod non possis abstinere quin ipsa scribas et doceas, quamvis
 nullam tibi laudem, sed summa pericula et vituperium creare possint.
 Ignosce, quaeso, quod liberè tibi tanquam fratri sensum meum aperiam.
 Si scripta ista in malevolorum manus incidant (ut facilè incident cum
 30 ab aliquot discipulis tuis habeantur), ex illis probare poterunt, et vel
 me iudice convincere, quod Voëtio paria facias etc.⁴ Quod ne in me
 etiam redundet, cogar deinceps ubique profiteri, me circa res Meta-
 physicas quam maximè à te dissentire, atque etiam scripto aliquo typis [250]
 edito id publicè testari, si liber tuus prodeat in lucem.⁵ Gratias quidem
 35 habeo quod illum mihi ostenderis, priusquam vulgares; sed non gratum
 fecisti, quod ea quae in eo continentur, privatim, me inscio, docueris.
 Nuncque omninò subscribo illorum sententiae, qui voluerunt, ut te intra
 Medicinae terminos contineres.⁶ Quid enim tanti opus est, ut ea quae ad
 Metaphysicam vel Theologiam spectant scriptis tuis immisceas, cum ea
 40 non possis attingere, quin statim in alterutram partem aberres? Prius,
 mentem, ut substantiam à corpore distinctam, considerando, scripseras
 hominem esse *ens per accidens*;⁷ nunc autem econtrà, considerando
 mentem et corpus in eodem homine arctè uniri, vis illam tantum esse
 45 *modum corporis*.⁸ Qui error multò peior est priore. Rogo iterum ut
 ignoscas, et scias me tam liberè ad te scripturum non fuisse, nisi seriò
 amarem et essem ex asse tuus Ren. DESCARTES.

Librum tuum simul cum hac Epistolâ remissem, sed veritus sum
 ne, si fortè in alienas manus incideret, severitas censurae meae tibi posset
 nocere, servabo itaque, donec rescivero te hanc Epistolam recepisse.

COMMENTARY

Date

Written in reply to R/D 56 and answered by R/D 58, the date of the letter lies between 6
 and 23 July 1645 [NS].

32 redundet *ExI*, AT] redundat CLE

3 Cf. D/R 45, ll. 34–58.

4 This probably means making claims without decent proof.

5 Descartes publicly denounced Regius' *Fundamenta physices* in the preface to the French translation of his *Principia* (Paris 1647; AT IXB 19–20).

6 Cf. D/R 41, n. 3.

7 Cf. D/R 29.

8 Cf. D/R 45. Cf. VERBEEK 1994, 549–550.

23 July 1645 [NS?]

Vie, II, 269–271 (no. 34).
 AT, IV, 254–256 (no. 393).

[*I.m.*: Schisme de Regius. Lettr. 34 MS. de Regius.]

« Je ne vois pas que j'aie grand sujet d'appréhender pour mon opi- | 270
 nion qui regarde l'homme, dont vous voudriez pourtant me faire un
 crime. Car je ne vous en ai dit autre chose, sinon qu'il est clair par
 l'Écriture sainte que l'âme raisonnable est une substance immortelle;
 5 mais qu'on ne peut le prouver par aucune raison naturelle, et que rien
 n'empêche qu'elle ne soit aussi bien un *mode du corps* [*i.m.*: Erreur
 que M. Desc. censurait.] qu'une substance qui en serait réellement
 distinguée.¹ C'est en quoi je crois avoir affermi l'autorité de l'Écriture
 en ce qui dépendait de moi; au lieu que ceux qui prétendent se servir des
 10 raisons naturelles, en cette occasion, semblent se défier de cette autorité
 divine; et n'alléguant que de faibles raisons trahissent la cause de l'âme
 et des saintes Écritures, par leur indiscretion ou par leur malice.² Ce n'est
 pas que je ne puisse, pour l'amour de vous, retrancher de ce sentiment
 ce que vous jugeriez à propos; mais, au reste, vous vous feriez peut-être
 15 plus de tort qu'à moi, si vous alliez publier par écrit ou de vive voix,
 que vous avez touchant la métaphysique des sentiments éloignés des
 miens. Car l'exemple d'un homme comme moi, qui ne passe point pour
 un ignorant dans votre philosophie, ne servira qu'à confirmer plusieurs
 personnes qui ont déjà des sentiments fort différents des vôtres sur ces
 20 matières; et ils ne pourront me refuser la qualité d'homme d'honneur,
 voyant que mes engagements passés avec vous ne m'empêchent pas de
 m'éloigner de vos sentiments, lorsqu'ils ne sont pas raisonnables.

Vous ne serez pas surpris de ma conduite, lorsque vous saurez que
 beaucoup de gens d'esprit et d'honneur m'ont souvent témoigné qu'ils
 25 avaient trop bonne opinion de l'excellence de votre esprit, pour croire
 que vous n'eussiez pas, dans le fonds de l'âme, des sentiments contraires

¹ Cf. D/R 57, ll. 22–28.

² Here Regius repeats Voetius' principal accusation of Descartes, namely that he is a concealed advocate of atheism; cf. ll. 23–27 below.

à ceux qui paraissent en public sous votre nom. [*I.m.*: Insulte qu'il faut
confronter avec le jugement qu'il avait autrefois des Méditat. de M.
Desc.³] Et pour ne vous en rien dissimuler, plusieurs se persuadent
30 ici que vous avez beaucoup décrédité votre philosophie, en publiant
votre métaphysique. Vous ne promettiez rien que de clair, de certain
et d'évident; mais, à en juger par ces commencements, ils prétendent
qu'il n'y a rien que d'obscur et d'incertain, et les disputes que vous
avez eues avec les habiles gens à l'occasion de ces commencements,
35 ne servent qu'à multiplier les doutes et les ténèbres. Il est inutile de
leur alléguer que vos | raisonnements se trouvent enfin tels que vous les
avez promis. Car ils vous répliquent qu'il n'y a point d'enthousiaste,
point d'impie, point de bouffon qui ne pût dire la même chose de ses
extravagances et de ses folies.⁴ Encore une fois, je consentirai que l'on
40 retranche de mon écrit ce qui peut vous y déplaire, si vous le jugez à
propos;⁵ mais, après tout, je ne vois rien qui puisse me faire honte, ou
que je doive me repentir d'avoir écrit. Ainsi rien ne m'oblige à refuser
l'impression d'un ouvrage, de l'édition duquel on peut espérer quelque
utilité. Pour vous, Monsieur, à qui j'ai déjà des obligations infinies, vous
45 me permettrez de vous remercier de la bonté que vous avez eue de lire
mon livre, ou pour mieux parler, votre livre, puisqu'il est véritablement
sorti de vous; et de la sincérité avec laquelle vous m'en avez dit votre
sentiment. Vous agréerez aussi la liberté avec laquelle je viens de vous
expliquer les miens, puisque cette liberté n'est que le fruit de l'amitié
50 dont vous m'honorez. »

³ Cf. R/D 12C.

⁴ Here Regius repeats Schoock's criticism that Cartesianism is a straight way to (religious) enthusiasm (SCHOOCK 1643/*Querelle*, 312–314; cf. VERBEEK 1992A, 21–22, 52; see also HEYD 1995, 109–143).

⁵ Regius indeed omitted several views in *Fundamenta physices* to comply with Descartes' wishes. But in response to Descartes' public denouncement of the work (cf. D/R 57, n. 5), Regius and his student Petrus van Wassenaeer published a broadsheet, *Explicatio mentis humanae* (1647), in which the Utrecht professor incorporated those parts of the text which he had suppressed in *Fundamenta physices*. The theses in question, II, III and XIII, are cited in D/R 45, notes 11 and 12.

23 July 1645 [NS?]

R/D 58

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter is in reply to D/R 57. Its date, 23 July 1645, is found in *Vie*⁶ and in the *ExI*. The calendar used cannot be determined with certainty, but as both hands in the *ExI* give the same date, it is probably New Style.⁷

⁶ 'Cette dernière lettre [D/R 57] fit enfin lever le masque à M. Regius; et résolu de sacrifier l'honneur de son maître au sien, il renonça tout de bon à sa discipline par une lettre assez cavalière, écrite du 23 de Juillet 1645, dans laquelle il voulut se décharger une bonne fois en ces termes' (follows R/D 58), *Vie*, II, 269.

⁷ See my Introduction, § 2.3.1.

CLE, I, 432–433 (no. 98).
 AT, IV, 256–258 (no. 394).
 AM, VI, 271–274; RL, 138–140; B, 248–250.

Vir Clarissime,

Maxima mihi iniuria fit ab illis, qui me aliqua de re aliter scripsisse quam
 sensisse suspicantur, ipsosque si qui sint scirem, non possem non habere
 pro inimicis. Tacere quidem in tempore, ac non omnia quae sentimus
 5 ultrò proferre, prudentis est; aliquid autem à sententiâ suâ alienum,
 nemine urgente, scribere, lectoribusque persuadere conari, abiecti et
 improbi hominis esse puto. Asserentibus non magni opus Philosophi
 esse, refellere rationes quae pro Animae Essentia Substantiali allatae [257]
 sunt, illasque interim nullo modo refellentibus, nec refellere valentibus,
 10 non possum non reponere tua haec verba: *quilibet Enthusiastes, et*
cacodoxus, et nugacissimus nugator idem de ineptissimis suis nugis
*pertinacissimè asserere potest.*¹ Caeterùm non vereor ne cuiusquam à
 me dissentientis autoritas mihi noceat, modò ne illi videar assentiri;
 nec volo ut, meâ causâ, ullo modo abstineas à quibuslibet scribendis et
 15 vulgandis; modo ne etiam aegrè feras, si palam profitear me à te quam
 maximè dissentire. Sed ne desim amici officio, cum mihi librum tuum
 eo fine reliqueris, ut quid de eo sentirem, à me intelligeres, non possum
 non apertè tibi significare, me omninò existimare tibi non expedire,
 ut quicquam de Philosophiâ in lucem edas, nec quidem de eius parte
 20 Physicâ. Primò, quia cum tibi à tuo Magistratu prohibitum sit, ne
 novam Philosophiam vel privatim vel publicè doceres,² satis causae
 dabis inimicis, si quid tale evulges, ut ob id ipsum de pro- | fessione 433
 tuâ te deturbent, ac etiam alias irrogent poenas; valent enim adhuc illi,
 et vigent, et fortassè cum tempore maiores vires sument quam verearis.
 25 Deinde, quia non video te quicquam laudis habere posse ex iis in quibus
 mecum sentis, quia ibi nihil de tuo addis, praeter ordinem et brevitatem,
 quae duo, ni fallor, ab omnibus benè sentientibus culpabuntur; neminem

1 Cf. R/D 58, ll. 37–39.

2 Cf. D/R 41, n. 3.

[late July or early August 1645]

D/R 59

enim adhuc vidi, qui meum ordinem improbaret, quique non potiùs me
nimiae brevitatis quam prolixitatis accusaret. Reliqua in quibus à me [258]
30 dissentis, meo quidem iudicio, reprehensione et dedecore, non autem
laude ullâ digna sunt, atque ideò iterum dico, expressis verbis, me
tibi, quantum possum, dissuadere istius libri editionem. Saltem expecta
tantisper, et ex Horatij consilio, *decimum premas in annum*;³ forsán enim
cum tempore ipsemet videbis, quam parùm tibi expediat eum edere.
35 Atque interim esse non desinam ex asse tuus Renatus DESCARTES.

COMMENTARY

Date

The letter is in reply to R/D 58 ([13/] 23 July) and consequently dates from late July or early August 1645.

³ Horace, *Ars poetica*, vs. 388: *nonumque prematur in annum*. In 1633, Descartes justified his decision to withhold publication of *Le Monde* quoting the same maxim (Descartes to Mersenne, [28 November 1633], AT I 272/CM III 559).

APPENDIX

H. Regius, *Physiologia, sive Cognitio sanitatis. Tribus disputationibus in Academiâ Ultrajectinâ publicè proposita* (Utrecht 1641).

Introduction

Regius' *Physiologia* is, as its subtitle indicates, a collection of disputations submitted at Utrecht University. Its relevance for the correspondence between Descartes and Regius was recognised by both Adam and Tannery, and De Vrijer, but they were unable to locate a copy of the work. In the 1960s, two copies were more or less simultaneously rediscovered by Roths Schuh and Micheli.¹ These copies reveal that each disputation actually consists of two parts:

- Physiologia* Ia, *De sanitate pars prior*, resp. J. de Raey,
pp. 1–8 (date: [17 April 1641 OS]).²
- Physiologia* Ib, *De sanitate pars posterior*, resp. C. Bruinvisch,
pp. 9–16 (date: 5/[15] May 1641).³
- Physiologia* IIa, *De actionibus naturalibus pars prior*, resp. J. Haymannus,
pp. 17–24 (date: late May 1641 or early June).⁴
- Physiologia* IIb, *De actionibus naturalibus pars posterior*, resp. J. Haymannus,
pp. 25–32 (date: [June]).⁵
- Physiologia* IIIa, *De actionibus animalibus pars prior*, resp. J. Blocquius,
pp. 33–40 (date: [June]).
- Physiologia* IIIb, *De actionibus animalibus pars posterior*, resp. J. de Raey,
pp. 41–50. This is the only disputation preceded by the (unnumbered) original covering title page (date: 30 June 1641 OS).

Over the last decades, seven more copies have been located, and these copies show that Regius continued the series of disputations after the summer of 1641. He commenced a second series of three disputations in the second half of 1641, and a third series of three disputations in 1643:

- Physiologia* IV, *De morbis*, resp. J. van Horn,
pp. 51–70. With the original title page (date: ... September 1641).⁶

1 Roths Schuh discovered a copy in Staatliche Bibliothek des Landes Bayern, Neuburg a/d Donau (ROTHSCHUH 1968). Micheli used a copy in the Albert Haller collection of the Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, Milan (M).

2 The date of the disputation is found in NH, 18/*Querelle*, 90.

3 Cf. R/D 18, n. 6.

4 Cf. D/R 21, *Date*.

5 Cf. D/R 22, *Date*.

6 The exact day is not specified.

Physiologia

- Physiologia* V, *De symptomatis specialibus*, resp. J. van Horn,
pp. 71–94. With the original title page (date: [10] November 1641 (OS)).⁷
- Physiologia* VI, *De morborum signis*, resp. J. de Raey,
pp. 95–119. With the original title page (date: 15 December 1641 (OS)).
- Physiologia* VII, *De diagnosi et prognosi morborum*, resp. M. Eversdyck,
pp. 121–140. With original title page (date: 25 March 1643 (OS)).
- Physiologia* VIII, *De hygieina*, resp. M. Eversdyck,
pp. 141–152. With original title page (date: 13 May 1643 (OS)).
- Physiologia* IX, *De therapeutica*, resp. J. de Raey,
pp. 153–180. With original title page (date: ... June 1643).

A comparison of most copies known to date shows that there are significant differences between the copies of the *Physiologia*. There are basically three types: 1. *Physiologia* consisting of the first three disputations; 2. *Physiologia* having the first six disputations; 3. *Physiologia* having all nine disputations.⁸ There is a relatively simple explanation for the many faces of Regius' *Physiologia*. Each disputation — in case of the first three disputations, each part — was printed shortly before it was submitted at Utrecht University, but above the number of copies required for the actual dispute, the publisher printed an extra set of copies, which were afterwards collected. When the first series was completed, a separate title page for the first three disputations was made. After the completion of the second series, disputations IV to VI were bound together with the first three. The rarity of a complete set, that is, a copy having all nine disputations, is easy to understand: in 1643 most copies of the first six disputations would probably have been sold out.

Textual note

The transcription of the text has been made in first instance from microfilms of the copies in Herborn and in the New York Academy of Medicine, and then checked against the copy in Milan. The original layout of title pages and dedications has been adhered to. The original lineation of the main text is not preserved, and catchwords and running-titles are omitted, but the original spelling, capitalisation, punctuation and accentuation have been followed. The exceptions to this rule are that the long *s*, and the use of *u* and *v* have been normalised, the ampersand (&) and the ligatures *æ* and *œ* are presented as *et*, *ae* and *oe*, and instantly recognisable contractions have been silently expanded. Obvious misprints have been silently corrected. Any other correction is indicated in the critical apparatus. Passages which are identical to or closely resemble parts in Descartes' letters to Regius are printed in a boldface font.

⁷ The exact day is not specified, but on the copy in National Library of Medicine (Maryland) the date 10 November is pencilled in (cf. GARIEPY 1990, 325).

⁸ Gariepy (GARIEPY 1990) located two copies in America: New York Academy of Medicine (dispp. I–VI); National Library of Medicine (dispp. I–V; no. V is incomplete). Dibon located a complete set of the *Physiologia* (dispp. I–IX) in Herborn (DIBON 1957). A copy in the British Library consists of the dispp. I–VI, to which the dispp. VII and VIII are added in manuscript. Finally, the Inventory of Dutch academic writings before 1801 ('Apparaat Van der Woude', Ancient and Rare Books Dept., Amsterdam University Library) lists a copy in Marburg University Library (dispp. I–III), and in Kiel University Library.

HENRICI REGII

Medicinae Doctoris et Professoris

PHYSIOLOGIA,

SIVE

COGNITIO SANITATIS;

Tribus disputationibus in
Academiâ Ultrajectinâ publi-
cè proposita.

ULTRAIECTI,

Ex Officinâ *AEgidii Roman*, Academiae
Typographi, Anno MDCXLI.

CICERO *lib. 3. Tusculan. quaest.*

Num fingo? Num mentior?

Refelli cupio. Quid enim

laboro, nisi ut veritas in omni

quaestione explicetur?

DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM

PRIMAE,

De SANITATE,

Pars prior.

Resp. Johanne de Raei, Gelro.⁹

THESIS I.

Medicina est ars medendi *humanae valetudini*: quae est partium nostri corporis qualiscunque ad agendum dispositio.

2. *Medicinae partes* duae sunt: *Cognitio* et *Curatio*. *Cognitio* est prior pars *Medicinae* de valetudine cognoscenda. Estque *physiologica* et *pathologica*.

5 3. *Cognitio physiologica* est de cognoscenda *Sanitate*.

Sanitas est dispositio partium humani corporis actionibus recte perficiendis apta.

DE PARTIBUS.

10 4. *Pars humani corporis* est quaelibet corporea substantia illud complens, actionibusque perficiendis comparata.

5. Estque vel *insensibilis* vel *sensibilis*.

Insensibilis est, quae ob suam exiguitatem, vel motus sui celeritatem sensum fugit.

15 Haec non est *indivisibilis*, nec semper ejusdem magnitudinis aut figurae sed, quantum ad talia, idem de ipsa, quod de reliquis corporibus est putandum.

Et quamvis ad istas *insensibiles particulas* alii medici vel philosophi non multum attendere consueverint; nos tamen ex illis innumera naturae mysteria pendere arbitramur.

20 Quia sine his nec *acrimoniae*, nec *lenitatis*, nec *subtilitatis*, nec *crassitiei*, nec *infinitarum aliarum qualitatum ratio* reddi potest: his autem positis, omnium *intelligibilis* est explicatio.

6. *Pars sensibilis* est, quae ex multis *insensibilibus* composita sub sensum cadit.

Ex *sensibilibus* aliae sunt *stabiles*, aliae *fluidae*. |

[2]

25 7. *Stabiles*, quae etiam *solidae* dicuntur, eae sunt, quarum *particulae* sibi mutuo satis firmiter annexae sunt, etsi non semper eundem situm et figuram observent; ut patet in *pulmone*, et *Intestinis*, quae *solidae partes* dicuntur, etsi potius alienis, quam suis terminis contineantur.

30 Harum *variae differentiae* à variis *principiis* solent desumi, quae etsi forsitan non magni momenti sint; nolumus tamen à *vulgari et tritâ viâ* recedere, ubicumque illam absque magno dispendio *veritatis* sequi licet.

8. *Primo à Principiis generationis* aliae dicuntur *spermaticae*, aliae *sanguineae*, aliae *mediae*.

⁹ Descartes' name figured on the original title page of the disputation. Cf. D/R 19B, 1. 2–3.

Physiologia I

Spermaticae sunt, quae in sui formatione plus seminis acceperunt quam sanguinis, ut putantur Os, Cartilago, ligamentum, fibra, membrana, nervus, vena, arteria, tendo, et medulla Cerebri.

5 *Sanguineae* sunt in quibus dominatus est sanguis supra semen: tales creduntur esse carnes musculorum, et parenchymatum et adeps.

Spermaticae in adultis neque perditae regenerantur, neque solutionem continui passae per similem substantiam uniuntur, sed tantum per dissimilem; contrarium fit in sanguineis.

Spermaticae, ut ajunt, sanguineis frigidiores sunt.

10 *Mediae partes* sunt, quae in neutram partem inclinantes, nihilo plus seminis, quam sanguinis habent; talis dicitur esse cutis.

9. Secundo à Compositione; aliae sunt similes, aliae dissimiles.

Partes *similes* sunt, quarum substantia est eadem, et ubique sibi similis.

15 Apud Galenum hae undecim similes numerantur, Os, Cartilago, ligamentum, membrana, tendo, fibra, vena, arteria, nervos, cutis, Caro: quibus addi possunt, adeps, pili, unguis.

Similaris harum partium essentia non exacte, sed perfunctorie judicatur: venae enim, arteriae, et nervi ex fibris et membranis sunt coagmentata.

20 *Dissimiles partes* sunt, quae in dissimiles particulas possint dividere; ut manus, pes: quae dividuntur in cutim, carnem, ossa, venas, arterias, nervos. [3]

10. Tertio à figurazione aliae sunt Organicae, aliae inorganicae.

Organicae sunt, quae ad actiones perficiendas certam et determinatam sensibilemque conformationem requirunt, ut nervus, vena, arteria, musculus, brachium, crus etc.

25 *Inorganicae* contra; ut os, Cartilago, caro simplex etc.

11. Quarto à dignitate aliae partes dicuntur Principes, aliae ministrae.

Principes partes sunt, quae nobilissimam edunt actionem. Tales proprie sunt Cor et Cerebrum.

Cor, quia est fons caloris vivifici, à quo omnes animalis actiones dependent.

30 *Cerebrum*, quia est sensationum omnium principium et immediatum organum mentis.

Aliae quaedam *partes minus propriè principes* appellantur, ut *jecur*, quia in eo sanguis fieri creditur; *Testes*, quia principia generationis existimantur: *Ventriculus*, quia Chyli praecipua est officina.

35 Aliae vero omnes, quae iis inserviunt, dicuntur ministrae. Atque haec de parte stabili sive solidâ diximus.

12. *Pars fluida* est, cujus particulae sibi mutuo non firmiter sunt annexae; sed facile disjunguntur.

40 Estque sanguis et spiritus: item humor ocularis, saltem aqueus, et vitreus; nam forte crystallinus melius inter solidas partes numeratur: itemque lac, semen etc. Quaecunque enim in humano corpore ita continentur, ut praeter naturam sit, si absint, quemadmodum lac in puerperis, semen in viris, etc. merito ejus partes dicuntur.

De sanitate, Pars prior

Sanguis est succus rubicundus, venis, Corde et arteriis naturaliter contentus, qui constat fatragine omnis generis partium alimentarium quae venas poterant ingredi; estque omnis nutritionis et vivificationis materia, magnumque corporis stabilimentum.

5 Hic communiter dividitur in partem pituitosam, biliosam, melancholicam, serosam et temperatam, quae ultima strictiori appellatione sanguinis dicitur, [4] sive sanguis merus.

Pars sanguinis *pituitosa* est pallidior, frigidior, et humidior ejus portio.

Biliosa est pars sanguinis flavior, calidior, et siccior.

10 *Melancholica* est portio sanguinis nigrior, frigidior, et siccior.

Serosa est pars sanguinis aquosior et salsior, totamque massam diluens.

Massa sanguinea hominis bene constituti plurimum continet sanguinis meri et serosi, minus pituitae, melancholiae, et bilis: quae tamen proportio magnam latitudinem obtinet.

15 13. *Spiritus* est pars fluida constans subtilissimo sanguinis halitu, estque praecipuum in functionibus fere omnibus obeundis instrumentum.

Primo. Hic dicitur esse insitus vel influens.

Spiritus insitus est, qui postquam in partem aliquam est immissus, ei aliquamdiu inhaeret.

20 Hunc à prima nativitate ad ultimam senectutem partibus non inhaerere comprobatur fluxa corporis nostri constitutio, quae perpetuo dissipata, restaurationem desiderans, spirituosas partes tamdiu retineri non patitur.

Spiritus influens est, qui in partem recens immittitur ad insiti redintegrationem.

Secundo. Spiritus potest dici alius naturalis, alius animalis.

25 *Naturalis est*, qui in Corde cum sanguine arterioso natus, vivificationi, nutritioni, et generationi famulatur.

Animalis spiritus est, qui ex carotidum arteriarum et plexus choroidis poris in ventriculos Cerebri exhalans actionibus animalibus ministrat.

Atque haec de corporis humani partibus.

30 DE BONA TEMPERIE.

14. *Sanitatis partes* duae sunt, bona temperies et apta partium conformatio.

Bona temperies ex communi aliorum sententia definiri potest elementorum, elementariumque qualitatum in mixto actionibus apta convenientia. [5]

35 Sed quia ad constitutionem eorum, quae mixta dicuntur, non magis requiritur quatuor elementorum concursus, quam ipsa, quae dicuntur, mixta ad constituenda haec corpora, quae elementa appellantur: cumque ex horum mixtione proprietates rerum mixtarum nec oriri nec explicari possint: frustra nobis videntur alii hoc in loco se fatigare in elementorum vulgo dictorum, nempe in terrae, aquae, aëris et ignis natura examinanda.

40 Et quia nos substantiam corpoream esse unicam omnium corporum materiam agnoscimus, nullasque isti materiae substantiales formas realiter ab illa distinctas adjungimus (exceptâ solâ animâ rationali, quam ad hominis compositionem

Physiologia I

requiri constat): nec etiam ullas in eâ qualitates imaginamur, quae propriè loquendo primae sint, et omnium corporum differentias constituent, praeter illas, quas sequentibus versiculis memoriae causâ cum Mente inclusimus:

*Mens, mensura, quies, motus positura, figura,
Sunt cum materia cunctarum exordia rerum.*

5

Ubi per *mensuram*, quantitatem omnem, tum continuam tum discretam, sive magnitudinem et numerum intelligimus:

Per *motum* vero illum solum, qui motus localis vulgo dicitur, et solus in rerum natura datur: nam motus generationis, corruptionis item accretionis et decretionis, nec non alterationis, sunt tantum varii motus locales particularum insensibilium, qui ad haec, tanquam effecta, cum particulis materiae concurrunt.

Atque ex his jam positis principiis omnium corporum naturalium affectiones et effecta clarissimè intelligi possunt: adeo, ut nullam certam et evidentem affectionis alicujus, aut effecti explicationem, aut de suo subjecto demonstrationem, sine iis dari posse existimemus.

15

Icirco *bona temperies* à nobis definitur: situs, figura, quantitas, et motus vel quies particularum insensibilium partes sensibiles constituentium, actionibus perficiendis conveniens.

15. A temperie, sive à primis qualitatibus ex quibus constat, omnes aliae corporis humani atque etiam reliquorum omnium tam homogeneorum, quam heterogeneorum corporum *qualitates* originem ducunt.

20

Cumque illae primae qualitates nihil plane in se contineant, quod non clarissime potest intelligi, omnes etiam aliae, quae nempe ex iis oriuntur, naturâ suâ manifestae sunt, nullae occultae: quamvis forte de multis, qua ratione ex primis constituentur, ignoremus.

25

16. *Qualitatum* autem nomine complectimur omne illud, à quo res aliqua potest qualis denominari: nec proinde ullus est earum numerus definitus.

Sed quae praecipuum in temperamentis humani corporis aliisque rebus medicis explicandis usum habent, sunt calor, frigus, humiditas, siccitas; quae primae ab aliis solent appellari; ac praeterea crassities, tenuitas, densitas, raritas, stabilitas, mollities, durities, fluiditas, aquosositas, oleaginositas, visciditas, volatilitas, fixitas, et similes.

30

Item sapes et odores, de quibus, ut et de lumine, coloribus, et sonis agemus in doctrina sensuum.

35

Item vires detergendi, incidendi, astringendi, laxandi, aperiendi, obstruendi, urgendi etc. de quibus in Curatione.

17. Calor alius est actualis, alius potentialis.

Calor actualis est varia agitatio insensibilium particularum: *frigus* autem est earum quies.

40

Atque hinc intelligimus cur vulgo (quamvis non satis bene) calor definiatur qualitas activa, homogenea congregans, heterogenea segregans: et frigus, qualitas homogenea et heterogenea conjungens.

Sensitur autem frigus dum ex quiete partium exteriorum corporis nostri ef-

[6]

De sanitate, Pars prior

fluvia insensibilis transpirationis, ob poros à frigore clausos, impediuntur; unde inordinatus quidam motus oritur, qui certam quandam sensationem producit, quam nos frigoris perceptionem appellamus.

Raro hae qualitates absolute sumuntur, sed fere semper comparatè: ut cum corporis alicujus particulae celerius moventur, quam particulae manuum nostrarum, illud calidum judicamus; cum tardius, frigidum: et manum unam alterâ calidiorem habentes idem interdum corpus unâ manu calidum, alterâ frigidum sentimus. |

[7]

18. *Calor potentialis* est aptitudo ad incalescendum, vel ad calefaciendum; sic calx viva vocatur calida, etiam cum ad tactum frigida apparet; atque omnia corpora, in quorum particulis magnus motus facile exitatur; itemque omnia, quae talem motum in aliorum corporum particulis excitare apta sunt, calida appellantur.

Contra vero omnia corpora, quorum particulae non facile agitantur, itemque omnis, quae agitationem particularum alterius corporis apta sunt impedire, potentiâ frigida dici possunt.

Et quia saepe idem corpus quorundam aliorum corporum particulas aptum est agitare; atque è contra impedire, ne quorundam aliorum particulae agitentur; horum respectu frigidum, illorum vero calidum dici potest.

19. *Humiditas* et *siccitas* sunt etiam vel actuales, vel potentiales.

Humiditas actualis proprie tantum est stabilium corporum, cum particulae aquae, vel alterius liquoris sensibilis, eorum poris ita insunt, ut ipsis inhaereant.

Siccitas actualis est eorundem corporum, cum ipsorum pori nullius liquoris sensibilis particulis, sed solo aëre, vel etiam corpore aëre tenuiore replentur.

Humiditas vero potentialis proprie tribuitur liquoribus crassiusculis, quia nempe aliorum corporum poros ingressi facilè illis inhaerent.

Et *siccitas potentialis* proprie tribuitur liquoribus tenuissimis quia aliorum corporum poros apti sunt ita pervadere, ut iis interim non adhaereant.

20. Sed abusivè etiam humida potentiâ dicuntur stabilia corpora, quae quomodolibet vel humefieri, vel alia humectare: et sicca potentiâ, qua vel exsiccari, vel alia exsiccare apta sunt.

Cum vero aër humidus dicitur, putandum est hoc fieri ratione particularum aquae in vaporem resolutae, quae per illum sparsae sunt; ut etiam illis sublatus dicitur siccus.

Et quantum ad humiditatem, quam plerique philosophi aëris elemento tribuunt, nullam ejus rationem agnoscimus, nisi quod ita conveniens esse ipsis visum fuit, ad duas ex quatuor suis primis qualitatibus, singulis ex suis quatuor elementis affingendas. |

[8]

21. *Crassities et tenuitas* respiciunt majorem vel minorem quantitatem insensibilium particularum, ex quibus sensibilia corpora componuntur: ut spirites vini dicitur aqua tenuior, quia particulis constat minoribus.

Densitas et raritas respiciunt poros, sive intervalla quae sunt inter istas insensibiles particulas; ita ut corpus dicatur densum, inter cujus particulas pauca sunt intervalla. Rarum vero, inter cujus particulas multum spatii intercedit. Nec ulla

Physiologia I

alia raritas vel densitas intelligibilis dari potest.

Stabilitas oritur ex quacunque adhaesione particularum insensibilium.

Durities ex omni mode firma ipsarum adhaesione.

5 *Mollities* ex non omnimode firma; qualis apparet in catenae annulis, qui sibi quidem mutuo omnes adhaerent, etiamsi facile ipsa catena quomodolibet inflectatur.

Fluiditas fit ex disjunctione et motu particularum insensibilium;

Aquositas designat partes istas fluidas esse laeves et oblongas;

Oleaginositas denotat illas esse ramosas;

10 *Viscositas* significat illas aegre et lente à se mutuo disiungi.

Volatilitas est insensibilium particularum ad dissipandum à calore facilitas, orta non tantum ex earum tenuitate et infirma cohaesione, sed etiam ex earum flexibilitate et figura dissipationi apta.

Fixitas autem contra.

15 22. Atque ita omnes aliae qualitates sensibiles ex solo motu, figura, magnitudine et situ particularum insensibilium clarissime possent explicari; et talis qualitatum cognitio ad omnes usus humanos facillime converti potest.

20 Sed quicumque ad insensibiles particulas non attendentes, calorem, frigus, humiditatem, et siccitatem pro primis qualitatibus assumserunt, atque per illas omnes corporum proprietates explicare sunt conati, multum obscuritatis in philosophiam et medicinam induxisse nobis videntur: praecipuèque illi, qui istas qualitates semper absolute considerantes, quamvis fere tantum comparatè debeant sumi, et potentiales ab actualibus non distinguentes, certos earum gradus singulis corporibus tribuerunt, dicentes hoc esse calidum ut duo, siccum ut tria, humidum ut duo; et
25 sic de caeteris, quorum eâ in re decretis non sine accurato examine est fidendum.

DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM

PRIMAE,

De SANITATE,

Pars posterior.

Resp. Cornelio Bruinvisch Zierizeâ-Zel.

[9]

THESIS I.

Jam verò *Temperies* alia est *moderata* seu temperata, alia *immoderata* sive Intemperata, ut quidam volunt.

Et quidem ii qui temperiem moderatam in aequalitate quatuor qualitatum quas primas vocant, consistere imaginantur, temperiem etiam omnem immoderatam ad
5 illis reducunt: adeò ut sit vel calida, vel frigida, vel humida, vel sicca; vel etiam calida simul et humida, vel calida et sicca, aut frigida et humida, vel frigida et sicca. Quod non sufficere perspicuum est ex eo, quod facile possit contingere, ut manentibus istis quatuor qualitativibus in eodem gradu, temperies compositi mutetur.

Malumus idcirco dicere *temperiem immoderatam* esse quemlibet excessum
10 qualitatum ortum ex situ, figura, magnitudine, motu vel quiete particularum insensibilium actionibus perficiendis nihilominus convenientem.

2. Praeterea *Temperies* alia est *totalis*, quae nempe in toto corpore simul spectatur; alia *partialis*, quae in singulis ejus partibus consideratur.

Totalis non male dividitur in melancholicam, biliosam, pituitosam et sanguineam. Cum enim solo sanguine corpus alatur, credibile est diversas temperies,
15 quae in illud induci solent, diversitati humorum in massa sanguinea apparentium respondere.

Singularum vero partium temperies, cum ad qualitates vulgo dictas primas refertur, dicitur cutis esse temperata, reliquae vero vel ad calidum, vel ad frigidum,
20 vel ad humidum, vel ad siccum deflectere dicuntur, idque hoc ordine: | [10]

Ad Calidum, spiritus, cor, Pulmo, sanguis, jecur, lien, Renes, Caro simplex, pinguedo.

Ad frigidum, Cerebrum, spinae medulla, nervus, vena, arteria, membrana, tendo, ligamentum, cartilago, os, pilus.

25 *Ad humidum*; fibrae nervorum, Cor, Renes Iecur, lien, caro simplex, spinae medulla, tunicae nervorum, Cerebrum, pinguedo, sanguis, spiritus.

Ad siccum, vena, arteria, membrana, tendo, ligamentum, cartilago os, pilus.

30 Quorum multa ob valde infirmas rationes dicuntur; et singularum partium naturam longe melius intelligi posse manifestum est, si his non neglectis, illarum praeterea crassities, densitas, durities, aquositas, vel oleaginositas, et similes aliae qualitates expendantur.

3. *Temperies* etiam alia est *nativa*, alia *adscititia*.

Nativa est, quae ex semine et sanguine materno in primo ortu est progenerata.

35 Hujus praecipua diversitas est à sexu; faeminae enim sunt molliores, humidiores, et frigidiores, quam viri: non quidem quod nulla mulier aliquo viro calidior aut siccior esse possit; sed quia caeteris paribus sexus muliebris de caliditate et

Physiologia I

robore multum demit: ex iisdem enim parentibus masculi robustiores esse solent, quam foeminae; et qui Eunuchi fiunt, temperie manifeste mutantur, postquam sexum amiserunt.

5 4. *Adscititia* temperies est, quae post primum ortum seu nativitatem per mutationem, et alterationem corporis ab internis externisque causis et accidentibus oritur.

Causae quibus adscititium temperamentum inducitur, praecipuae sunt aetas, tempestas anni, diversitas regionis, consuetudo.

10 *Aetas* est pars durationis vitae, in qua ex actione caloris nativi in humidam reliquamque corporis substantiam, temperies corporis sensibilem mutationem suscipit.

5. *Aetas* non incommode distinguitur in pueritiam, adolescentiam, Iuventutem, virilem aetatem, et senectutem.

15 Prima aetas est *pueritia*, quae plerunque quatuor-decim primis annis | describitur, in qua corpora nostra caliditate et humiditate excedere dicuntur: caliditas tamen est moderata, cujus rei testimonium praebet tactus. Haec distinguitur in tempus ante dentitionem, ipsius dentitionis, quod dentitionem sequitur, et quod tandem pubertati est vicinum. [11]

20 Altera aetas est *adolescentia*, temperata magis, pubertatem ad decimum-octavum annum, et Adolescentiam proprie dictam ad vigesimum-quintum includens.

25 Tertio sequitur aetas florens vel *Iuventus*, ab anno vigesimo-quinto ad trigesimum-quintum circiter: in qua corpora nostra sunt calida et sicca; propterea quod humidum aqueum praecedentibus aetatibus fit admodum absumptum, partesque oleaginosae arctius compactae, calorem et spiritus magis retineant.

Iuvenes igitur calidiores sunt pueris.

Quarto succedit *aetas virilis* seu constans vel consistens, ab anno trigesimo-quinto, ad quinquagesimum annum sese extendens, in qua calor fervorque remissiones sunt, et actiones adhuc optime perficiuntur.

30 Tandem super est *Senectus* frigida et sicca, quae *Viridis* ab anno quinquagesimo ad sexagesimum; in qua muneribus obeundis senes plerumque adhuc praeesse possunt: *Media* autem ab anno sexagesimo ad septuagesimum annum, quae majori cum imbecillitate suas actiones exequitur: Denique ultima et *decrepita*, quae vitam frigiditate et siccitate claudit.

35 Hae aetates in omnibus hominibus ob varias causas, tum internas tum externas, iisdem annorum terminis non circumscribuntur.

40 6. Praeter aetates ad mutationes temperamentum nativi plurimum quoque inserviunt *tempestates anni*, tum quia ab accessu et recessu solis, radiorumque solarium perpendiculari vel obliquo reflexu, aër in hisce magnopere alteratur, qui corpora nostra ambit, atque alterat; tum quia corpora pro diversitate temporis praecedentis diversimode sunt constituta.

E quatuor anni temporibus, *ver* quidem et *autumnus* ratione caloris sunt temper-

7 adscititium] adscititum *Phys.*

De sanitate, Pars posterior

ata; quanquam *vere* major sit diversitas inter frigus | noctis et calorem diei, quam [12]
autumno; sed aëris siccitas *vere* est maxima, sensimque aestate minuitur, usque ad
medium autumnii, quo tempore maxima aëris humiditas esse solet; ideoque tunc
omnia longe facilius quam *vere* putrescunt.

5 Sed in humano corpore *vere* sanguis, et Aestate bilis; autumno et hyeme
pituita et melancholia generari solent.

7. *Locorum regionumque diversitas*, ex varia climatum, positusque caeli
aliarumque circumstantiarum constitutione, externum aërem alimentaue diversi-
mode immutans, plurimum etiam ad mutationem temperamentorum inducendam
10 valet.

Uti et *consuetudo*, quae est rei alicujus frequens usurpatio, qua tempera-
mentum, vel alia corporis constitutio immutatur, nosque ad actiones perficiendas
aptiores vel ineptiores sumus.

8. Denique *temperies* alia est *permanens*, alia est *fugiens*.

15 Ab aliis dividitur in temperiem vivi et mixti; sed male: quia temperamentum
vivi, est etiam mixti.

Temperies permanens est, quae ex sola partium stabilium constitutione de-
pendet; quaeque idcirco etiam post mortem aliquandiu potest durare.

In hac considerari quidem possunt humiditas et siccitas, prout sunt actu (quia
20 humorem particulae, solidarum partium poris impactae, ita iis adhaerent, ut pro
fluidis non habeantur): calor vero et frigus non nisi ut sunt potentiâ, earumque
judex est ratio; neque enim secundum hanc temperiem permanentem manus frigida
differre putatur à calida.

9. *Temperies fugiens* est, quae ex fluidis partibus pendens in vivis perpetuo
25 fugit et restituitur; in mortuis ob defectum restitutionis mox extinguitur.

Haec itaque ad omnes humores corpore contentos se extendit; neque enim
sanguis in animali mortuo frigescent eandem retinet temperiem, quam habuit in
vivo, et potest aliquis ad humores pituitosos valde dispositus ex esu calidorum et
dulcium multum bilis in venis coacervasse, in quo casu secundum permanentem
30 erit pituitosus, et secundum fugientem biliosus.

De Calido Nativo

Sed in hac temperie fugiente praecipue spectatur *calor ille in corde accensus*,
et per omnes vivi animalis interiores partes diffusus, qui nunquam in mortuo
reperitur. | [13]

35 Hujus veram causam plerique non intelligentes, *innatum quoddam calidum*
vel *spiritum primigenium*, vel *humidum radicale* imaginati sunt cujus naturam
nunquam distincte explicuerunt.

Cum autem advertimus non omnem ignem in flamma erumpere, sed in iis
fere omnibus, quae fermentantur, sentiri quendam ignem sine flamma, qui à vulgari
40 non nisi ratione intensionis differt; ut patet in faeno humido, et in multis aliis, in
quibus ita interdum intenditur, ut etiam flammam emittat: nihil magis obvium

36 imaginati] imaginat *Phys.*

Physiologia I

est, quam ut putemus calorem illum, talem etiam esse ignem non lucidum in corde animalis à primo vitae initio accensum, qui sanguine alitur, et in cujus sola extinctione mors consistit.

5 Ac Circulationem sanguinis scientes, facile percipimus, qua ratione magna ejus copia, singulis pulsibus in corde accensa, per arterias in omnia membra dispergatur, atque illa calefaciat.

Itaque *calidum nativum* est ignis non lucidus in sanguine in Cor influente accensus, et per corpus cum eodem sanguine distributus.

10 10. Ex quibus, ut etiam ea quae ab aliis dicta sunt explicemus, putandam est, illos *calidum vel humidum innatum* dixisse, non quod illud ipsum individuum calidum, quod in infante fuit, in sene etiam decrepito reperiatur; sed quia à nativitate ad mortem usque, simile humidum in locum dissipati continuo restituitur.

15 Et, sive dixerint *calorem nativum esse elementarem, sive caelestem*, facile assentimur, quia nullam inter utrumque agnoscimus differentiam, sed unius et ejusdem naturae esse putamus, qui fovet, qui generat, et qui urit.

20 Quatenus autem hic calor ope spirituum, qui sunt in sanguine, jam inde à primâ geniturâ communicatur, dici potest *Spiritus primigenius*; et quatenus id fit ope sanguinis, ac praecipue partium ejus oleaginosarum, quae pro humidis habentur, vocari potuit *humidum primigenium*: et quia hic calor praecipue communicatur per sanguinis partes, tum *spirituosas*, quae maxime sunt mobiles, et facillime quasvis corporis partes sua subtilitate penetrant; tum *oleaginosas*, quae cohaesione sua impediunt, quo minus spiritus possint dissipari, et in poris suis materiam aetheream ita disponunt, ut fortius agat: quod ni fieret, calor brevissimè extingueretur: Hinc non male definit Fernelius *calidum innatum, quod sit humidum primigenium spiritu et calore insito perfu-* | *sum*: et alij, *quod sit substantia quaedam corporis nostri* [14] *primigenia pinguis et oleosa, calore naturali perfusa.*

30 11. Hic *calor nativus* non semper in eodem statu permanet, sed aetatis decursu primum augetur, deinde constitit ac tandem diminuitur: nam *initio vitae*, cum partes solidae corporis sunt adhuc valde molles, non tantum motui fluidarum obsistunt, quam in *media aetate*, nec idcirco tanta vi fluidae agitantur: ac praeterea inter fluidas plures sunt aquaeae quam oleagineae, quae idcirco alendo igni minus sunt aptae. In Senectute vero partes rursus aquaeae permultae, pauciores vero oleagineae in sanguine reperiuntur: quia partes solidae, per quas succus ciborum colatur ut sanguis fiat, sensim evadunt duriores, et earum pori minus anfractuosi, quam par sit ad bene temperatum sanguinem generandum.

35 Ex quibus potest concludi ad longam vitam non tam requiri naturam quae ab ineunte aetate fuerit maxime temperata; quàm eam, in qui eae qualitates initio defecerint, quae procedente aetate solent augeri; eae vero, quae solent minui, excesserint. Et de Temperie hactenus.

40 *De Aptâ partium Conformatione.*

12. *Conformatio* est, qua sensibiles corporis partes (quae solae à Medicis pro partibus haberi solent) in organa actionibus idonea finguntur.

De sanitate, Pars posterior

Conformationis tria sunt membra; justa quantitas; apta figuratio; bona constructio.

Iusta quantitas consistit in *numero* decenti; quo nec justo sunt plures nec pauciores: item in *magnitudine* convenienti, qua nec justo sunt majores nec minores.

5 *Apta figuratio* est secundum organorum cavitatem vel secundum superficiem.

In cavitatibus requiritur libertas, et justa amplitudo.

In superficie Laevitas vel asperitas; planities vel gibbositas; rectitudo vel curvitas etc.

10 *Bona constructio* est pars conformationis, qua organa inter se salubriter aptantur.

Eaque consistit in partium *situ* et inter se *nexu* salubri.

Situs salubris est, quo suum quaelibet pars locum obtinet.

Nexus quo concinne partes copulantur.

De Actionibus et Anima humana. |

[15]

15 13. Atque haec de Sanitatis partibus, bona sc. temperie, et apta partium conformatione diximus. Antequam verò ad species ejus accedamus, videndum quomodo sanitas in genere cognoscatur.

20 Sanitas quidem innotescit, tum ex se, tum ex corporis accidentibus, sed propriè ex actionibus salubribus, seu talibus, quae et tempesticae sunt, et porro quantitate et qualitate moderatae.

Actiones sunt operationes ab homine vi animae humanae, vel corporis, vel utriusque factae.¹⁰

14. *Anima humana* est actionum humanarum primum in homine principium.

25 Per *primum principium* intelligo primam efficientem causam, quam Aristotelici *actum primum* vel *εὑτελεχελαιον* dicunt, idque ob facultates, per quas tanquam causas secundas seu instrumentarias quidam animam operari praedicant: alii tamen statuunt ab animâ immediatè operationes fieri, ut à calore fit calefactio.

15. ***Anima in homine unica est, nempe rationalis.***

30 **Neque enim actiones humanae ullae censendae sunt, nisi quae à ratione dependent, vis autem vegetandi, et corporis movendi, quae in plantis et brutis anima vegetativa et sensitiva appellantur, in homine quidem reperiuntur, attamen animae in ipso non sunt appellandae, quia non sunt primum eius actionum principium, et toto genere differunt ab anima rationali.**¹¹

35 16. ***Vis autem vegetativa in homine nihil aliud est, quam certa partium corporis constitutio,***¹² quâ substantiae corporeae calorisque perpetuam dissipationem per succum à corde praeparatum, et in partes impulsus, conservamus, et ex semine nostri simile procreamus.

Succi illius apta ad corpus caloremque conservandum à corde distributio, *vita* dicenda est: uti distributionis istius privatio, *Mors*.

¹⁰ Cf. D/R 20, l. 13–18.

¹¹ Cf. D/R 19B, l. 19–24.

¹² Cf. D/R 19B, l. 25–26.

Physiologia I

17. **Vis autem sensitiva**¹³ est partium humani corporis in spiritus, nervos et alia sensoria: item fibras, musculos, et artus talis conformatio, quâ homo ab objectis, tum internis, tum externis, variis motibus citra cogitationem, affici, totoque corpore se de loco in locum movere potest.

5 18. **Hae duae itaque** (quae *Natura* corporis appellari possunt) **nihil aliud sunt, quam corporis humani**¹⁴ aptè conformati apta temperies: quandoquidem omnes illarum operationes ab hac ita fieri queunt, ut in horologio et aliis automatis plurimae actiones admirandae à solâ | partium conformatione peraguntur: ita ut [16] non opus sit aliquam substantialem incognitamque formam hic vel alibi in similibus fingere, entiaque contra verissimum Philosophiae dictatum, multiplicare absque
10 necessitate.

18.¹⁵ *Anima rationalis* est substantia incorporea, quâ actiones cogitativas exercemus.

Actiones cogitativae sunt, quas cogitantes, seu ad rem attendentes peragimus.

15 *Haec* est incorruptibilis et immortalis, **cumque à corpore sit distincta** et diviniore edat actiones, quam quae à sola corporis dispositione fieri possunt, **non immerito sola à nobis anima**, vel ob ejus eminentiam, **Mens appellatur**.¹⁶

19. Ut *corporis essentia* in eo solo constitit, quod sit substantia in longum latum et profundum se extendens: Ita *Mentis seu animae rationalis essentia* est sita
20 in solâ substantiâ cogitante: quae ut corpore est perfectior, ita eo est intelligibilior. Atque ut *extensio à corporè* non potest tolli, ita nec *cogitatio ab animâ rationali*: quamvis *cogitationis* in nobis non sit perpetua recordatio, uti nec aliorum cogitatorum semper firma est memoria.

20. *Frustra autem quaeritur, an tota sit in toto, et in singulis partibus tota*:
25 seu an tota ejus essentia per totum corpus sit diffusa et extensa, et in singulis partibus tota existat: cum corporum proprium sit sese extendere, et *totum* vocari ab iis essentiis sit alienum, quae nullas partes habent. Atque ita multae quaestiones evitari possunt, quae alioquin haud facile intelligi aut solvi posse videntur.

30 Qui itaque *hanc quaestionem* proponunt, illi animam rationalem tanquam corpus considerant.

21. *Animae rationalis facultates* duae sunt: *Intellectus et voluntas*. Hae ab *animâ seu Mente* realiter non differunt, sed tantum ratione: nam *Intellectus et voluntas* sunt ipsa *anima* intelligens et volens. *Intellectio* verò, et *Volitio* differunt
35 **tantum ut actio et passio ejusdem substantiae: Intellectio enim propriè mentis passio est, Volitio ejus actio. Sed quia nihil unquam volumus, quin simul intelligamus; et vix etiam quicquam intelligimus, quin simul aliquid velimus, ideo non facile in iis actionem à passione distinguimus**.¹⁷

Atque haec de *Anima*, redeamus ad *Actiones*.

13 Cf. D/R 19B, I. 27.

14 Cf. D/R 19B, I. 28.

15 *Sic*.

16 Cf. D/R 19B, II. 31–36.

17 Cf. D/R 19B, I. 29–34.

DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM

[17]

SECUNDAE,

De ACTIONIBUS

NATURALIBUS;

Pars prior,

Resp. Ioanne Haymanno ZiriZaeâ-Zelando.

THESIS I.

Actiones sunt vel naturales vel animales. Alii dividunt eas in naturales, vitales et animales; sed prior distributio magis placet: quia vitales sub naturalibus comprehenduntur.

5 *Naturales sunt quae à solâ partium natura seu temperie et conformatione fiunt et perficiuntur. Dico fiunt et perficiuntur, ad discrimen actionum animalium: hae enim à naturali quidem corporis dispositione fiunt, sed ab anima cogitativa, seu rationali, quae sola à me anima appellatur, perfectionem accipiunt.*

Eaeque sunt duplices, alitura et Generatio.

De Alitura.

10 2. *Alitura est actio naturalis, qua perpetuus calor, substantiaeque corporeae defluxus ope sanguinis, praecipueque arteriosi, à corde in partes alendas impulsus, continuò restauratur.*

15 *Hepar itaque alias partes non alit, quia vim alimentum in illas impellendi non habet; nec partes alendae quidquam possunt attrahere per vim magneticam, vel aliam quamlibet, qualis dicitur esse fuga vacui, similitudo substantiae, calor, dolor, etc.; nec partes habent intellectum bonum à malo discernendi.*

20 *Cumque haec restauratio sit continua, et sine intermissione fiat: falsum itaque est aliquos, permultos annos, sine alimento vixisse: cui sententiae, fallacia Evae Vliengae in Comitatu Meursensi anno 1628 | detecta, luculentum praebet testi- [18] monium.¹⁸*

3. *Aliturae inserviunt appetitus alimentarius, coctio, distributio, separatio, excretio.*

25 *Vulgò dicunt aliturae inservire, attractionem, retentionem, coctionem, excretionem: quod displicet, quia ut antea diximus, partes nihil possunt attrahere.*

Retentio vero est tantùm moderata distributio.

De Siti et Fame.

4. *Appetitus alimentarius est dispositio quaedam phantasiae, per quam impellimur ad motus membrorum, alimento prosequendo idoneos.*

¹⁸ Eva Vliegen (Meurs, c. 1575–after1628) was said to have been fasting since 1597. She became very famous and attracted many illustrious visitors. In 1628, however, she was exposed as a fraud. Cf. VAN DETH/VANDEREYCKEN 1988, I, 78–81.

Physiologia II

Alimentum est corpus humanae naturae ita simile conveniensque, ut à calore ejus subigi, et in eam verti possit. Estque esculentum, quod *cibus*: vel potulentum, quod *potus* nuncupatur; talia sunt carnes animalium, herbae, fructus, semina, lac vinum etc.

5 *Appetitus* est vel *sitis*, vel *fames*.

Sitis est appetitus potus, natus ex faucium et Oesophagi ariditate ob expulsam humiditatem è ventriculo; quò phantasia potum imaginatur in auxilium.

10 *Fames* est appetitus cibi, ortus est ex morsu inaniti ventriculi ab acribus quibusdam succis, ex arteriis in ventriculum continuò illabentibus, qui post expulsionem chyli, non inveniunt quod corrodant, ventriculum pungunt, quo nervi sextae conjugationis certo modo moti, imaginationem excitant cibi sumendi, in morsus illius remedium.

De Coctione.¹⁹

15 5. *Coctio* est adaptio **particularum insensibilium ex quibus alimenta constant, ut ea conformationem humano corpori idoneam acquirant.**²⁰

Itaque haec non consistit in generatione aut corruptione formae alicujus substantialis, sed tantum accidentariae.

20 Omnes enim formae, praeter animam rationalem, sunt tantum accidentariae, vel potius modales quaedam qualitates. Unde patet, nos non amplius indigere illo vulgato quorundum philosophorum dicto, quo affirmant *formas è potentia materiae educi, et in illam relabi*: quod | absurdum putent, *illas, quae* ipsis sunt substantiae vel substantiales, in generatione è nihilo fieri, et in corruptione in nihilum redigi. Ab omni enim absurditatis metu nos liberamur etiamsi ipsius formae è nihilo productionem, et annihilationem statuamus: cum *forma* nihil aliud revera sit, quam comprehensio motus vel quietis, item magnitudinis, situs et figurae partium materiae seu corporis, rebus naturalibus conveniens; in quà nihil substantiale seclusâ ingenerabili et incorruptibili materiâ continetur. [19]

25 6. *Coctio* est duplex: **Alia Communis, quae fit in omnibus viis**, per quas particulae alimenti transeunt;

30 **Alia propria; eaque praecipua.**

Quae rursum triplex: I quae fit in ventriculo et Intestinis: II quae in liene et Hepate: III quae in Corde.

35 7. *In Ventriculo et Intestinis fit coctio, cum cibus ore masticatus et deglutitus, uti et potus, vi caloris à Corde communicati, et humoris ab arteriis eo impulsus dissolvitur, et in chylum convertitur.²¹*

8. *In liene*, cum pars chyli è ventriculo per *vas breve* ejusque ramos in illum propulsa, ibique cum sanguine ex arteriis per lienem diffusis in venas transeunte mista, à calore ejus subigitur; quae deinde per *ramum splenicum*, cum sanguine ex *vena haemorrhoidali* ascendente in *Venam portae*, et ex illa porrò in *Hepar*,

¹⁹ Cf. D/R 13, I. 1.

²⁰ Cf. D/R 13, II. 8–9.

²¹ Cf. D/R 13, II. 10–15.

ulterius ibidem cum alio sanguine et chylo coquenda confluit; ut in vivo animali, ligatis his vasis, docet autopsia.

5 9. *In hepate; cum chylus*, primùm per infinitos ventriculi et intestinorum poros in venas caeliacas, meseraicas, et lacteas; et ex his deinde in hepar, **non aliquâ vi attractrice, sed solâ suâ fluiditate et pressione vicinarum partium**, ut diaphragmatis, musculorum abdominis, aliarumque, adjuvante sanguinis in corde ebullitione, **delatus, sanguinique reliquo** eo confluenti **mistus, ibi fermentatur, et, ut chymicorum more loquar, digeritur, ac in chymum abit.**²²

10 Nec contrarium ex eo probatur; quod venâ aliquâ lacteâ vel meseraicâ duobus locis ligatâ, et deinde illâ solâ ligaturâ, quae cordi est vicinior, solutâ, semper, dum partes adhuc calent, chylus ad hepar, sanguis ad cor moveatur.²³ Quia hoc tantum fit à contractione vaso. Tum spontanea, qualis apparet in multis corporibus praeter modum etiam leviter tensis: et praeterea ab humoris contenti fluiditate. | [20]

15 Existimo autem chylum ingredi venas non tantum lacteas, sed etiam caeliacas, vas breve, et meseraicas;²⁴ primo quia nulla ratio suadet, cur in illarum, quam in harum poros magis sese insinuet; et deinde quod prae fame languentes, ab alimentis sumtis, mox refocillentur: Cum tamen pylorus, in superiori parte ventriculi situs, illa non ita celeriter in intestina possit transmittere, nec ulla vena lactea ad ventriculum pertingat: neque ulla, praeter venas, sit via, quae chylum ad
20 hepar vel cor deducat.

Est autem hic observatu dignum, quod venae lacteae, ubi succo alimentari, ab intestinis suppeditato, sunt plenae, semper albicent: quod extremitates ipsarum, cum nullis arteriis sint continuatae, ac ideo nullum sanguinem ab illis in cavitates suas recipiant: Cum contrarium fiat in venis caeliacis et meseraicis aliisque, in
25 quibus albicans chylus à ventriculo et intestinis subministratus, ob sanguinem à continuis arteriis in illas perpetuò propulsum, mox ita ruborem contrahit, ut vinum album, in cyathum rubelli conjectum, statim rubedine tingitur.²⁵

10. *In corde fit coctio, cum chymus sanguini à reliquo corpore ad cor redeuntî permistus, et simul cum eo in Hepate praeparatus, in verum et
30 perfectum sanguinem, per ebullitionem pulsificam, commutatur.*²⁶

Atque haec *tertia peculiaris praeparatio*,²⁷ quae est *vera sanguificatio*, duplex est: *prior et posterior*. *Prior sanguificatio* fit in dextro cordis ventriculo, ex sanguine è vena cava in illum incidente.

35 *Posterior* fit in sinistro cordis thalamo è sanguine, qui ex dextro ventriculo per venam arteriosam in arteriam venosam antea propulsus, in sinistrum cordis ventriculum instillatur. *Utriusque haec est Historia: Vena cava dextro cordis lateri adhaerens*, tres habet valvulas foris intrò spectantes: *sinistro verò cordis lateri* inseritur *arteria venosa*, duabus valvulis foris apertis instructa; cumque

22 Cf. D/R 13, ll. 15–18.

23 Cf. D/R 21, ll. 23–27.

24 Cf. D/R 20, l. 5–9.

25 Cf. D/R 13, n. 18.

26 Cf. D/R 13, ll. 18–21.

27 Cf. D/R 13, l. 21.

Physiologia II

haec vasa valde sint lata, et ob circulationem mox explicandam magnâ sanguinis
copiâ perpetuò abundant, hinc necessariò, ubi *cordis ventriculi* sanguine non sunt
distenti, duae satis magnae guttae, una è *vena cava* in dextrum sinum, atque
altera ex *arteria venosa* in sinistrum ventriculum incidunt: quae, propter | suam ad [21]
5 dilatandum aptitudinem, cordisque calorem et reliquias sanguinis ibi ardentes, mox
accenduntur, et dilatantur; quo valvulae, per quas guttae sunt ingressae, clauduntur,
et cor distenditur. Sed quoniam ob angustiam sinuum, sanguis magis magisque
rarescens illic haerere non potest: idcirco, eodem poenè momento, in dextro
ventriculo tres valvulas *venae arteriosae* intus foras spectantes, aperit; et porrò à
10 calore agitatus per venam arteriosam erumpit, eamque cum omnibus suis ramis
distendendo, sanguinemque contentum propellendo, pulsare facit: in sinistro verò
sinu, tres valvulas arteriae magnae, intus foras spectantes, pandit, per easque in
arteriam magnam erumpit, eandemque dilatat, et proximum sanguinem prioribus
pulsibus calefactum et expulsum in reliquas totius corporis arterias propellit, easque
15 eo distendit et vibrat. Quoniam autem expulso è cordis ventriculis sanguine, cor ex
parte evacuatur, ipseque sanguis in arteriis refrigeratur, arteriaeque in dilatatione
quasdam partes, per poros suos tum magis patentes, foras emittant. Hinc postea
cor et arteriae detumescunt et subsidunt: quo contingit, ut denuo duabus aliis
guttis detur in cor ingressus; quibus rursus dilatatis et propulsis, nova fit cordis et
20 arteriarum dilatatio et subsidencia. *Cumque* hic sanguinis motus sit perpetuus, hinc
sequitur illos alternatos cordis pulsus, quamdiu animal vivit, etiam esse perennes.
Quoniam vero sanguini è vena cava, et arteria venosa, cordis ventriculos ingressuro,
transeundum est per *auriculas*, quae cordi ad fines dictorum vasorum sunt adnexae,
idcirco cordis et auricularum contrarius est motus: dum enim cor impletur, hae
25 deplentur; dumque illud depletur hae replentur.

Admirandus igitur ille *Cordis arteriarumque motus*, praeter sanguinis in corde
existentis ebullitionem, quae causa ejus continens est, à quatuor *antecedentibus*
perficitur causis; *primo* à sanguinis cor ingredientis ad dilatationem aptitudine;
Secundo à cordis calore: *Tertio* à parte sanguinis, quae post singulos pulsus ardens,
30 aut tanquam fermentum, in corde remanet: *quarto* à cordis vasorumque ipsius
conformatione; non autem à peculiari *facultate pulsifica* cordi insitâ, et arteriarum
tunicis ab ipso communicata.

De Pulsu.

12. *Utrique cordis sanguificationi comes est pulsus, ministra verò sanguinis
35 circulatio.* | [22]

Pulsus est motus, quo cor et arteriae, ab ebulliente et protruso per vices
sanguine, alternatim dilatantur et contrahuntur. Ejus *partes* duae sunt *Diastole* et
Systole.

Diastole est pars pulsus, quâ cor à sanguine ex vena cava in dextrum ventricu-
40 lum, et ex arteria venosa in sinistrum incidente, ibidemque rarescente et ebulliente;
arteriae verò à rarefacto in corde sanguine, atque in illas erumpente, reliquumque

34 12.] sic

De actionibus naturalibus, Pars prior

arteriarum sanguinem propellente, et illum ac tunicas earum concutiente, eodem momento dilatantur.

5 Tum temporis enim, ut etiam illi significant, qui hic à nobis dissentiunt, mucro accedit ad basin, et latera cordis, quae costas dextras et sinistras respiciunt, ut majus intus fiat spatium, versus mediastinum cordis parietem accedunt: et latus sternum spectans, totum, ac praecipuè ad basin, attollitur, tenditur, pectus ferit, et quem sentimus pulsum facit.

10 13. *Systole* est pars pulsus qua Cor propter expulsam ebullientis sanguinis partem, detumescit; et simul arteriae, ob aliquam sui per poros evacuationem et refrigerationem sanguinis impulsu, subsidunt.

Tum enim, etiam ex eorundem indicio, latus cordis, sternum spectans, concidit; ibique maximè, ubi orificio aortae respondet: dextrum vero et sinistrum latus versus dextras sinistrasque costas collabascit; mucro recedit à basi, totumque cor laxum esse et molle sentitur.

15 14. *Itaque* sanguinis è Corde in arterias protrusio fit in utrorumque Diastole, quae eodem tempore in utrisque contingit, non in Cordis systole: quod evidentissime probatur vulneribus, quae Cordi et arteriis infliguntur, in quibus, in utrorumque diastole, ad oculum videre est, simul Cor et arterias intumescere, vulnera et ventriculos insuperiori parte, ut jam commemoravimus, dilatari, sanguinemque
20 subsultim effluere.

Porro si quis etiamnum de tempore diastoles cordis dubitet: ille cor canis adhuc calens duobus simul follibus per venam cavam et arteriam venosam alternatim inflatum inspiciat: ea enim ratione clarissime diastole et systole cordis possunt
25 dignosci.²⁸

Neque dilatationi cordis adversatur laterum costas spectantium ad mediastinum parietem, mucronisque ad basin accessus. Nam ut o- | perosiores demonstrationem praeteream, idem bajuli nostri saccularii in saccorum, et quilibet in chirothecae repletionem et dilatationem quotidie observat. [23]

De Sanguinis Circulatione.

30 15. *Sanguinis Circulatio* est motus, quo sanguis è Corde per arterias perpetuò expellitur in venas quae arteriis sunt continuæ, et è venis porrò repellitur in ipsum Cor.

35 Cum enim Cor ab una parte habeat arteriam magnam, ab altera venam Cavam, quarum rami in capillaria vasa attenuati, sine ulla interruptione inter se continuantur; quod clarè arguit sanguinis ascensus per venas plurimas conspicuus, qui per carnes extra vasa transire nequit, ut pote necessario ibi coagulandus, nec usquam alium quam per venas transitum invenire potest: Cumque omnes arteriae et venae sanguine sint plenae. Sanguinis itaque aliquantâ parte vi fervoris è cordis thalamis in arterias propulsâ, necessariò tantundem in venas et consequenter rursus in cordis
40 ventriculos propellitur.

²⁸ Cf. D/R 21, l. 28–31.

Physiologia II

Notandum autem est, ex illa sanguinis in corde ebullientis in vasa propulsione, arterias omnes uno momento pulsare, quia sanguis à capite arteriae latiore pellitur in sanguinem contentum in arteriis se paulatim attenuantibus; venas vero non pulsare, quia sanguis ex arteriis capillaribus in venas se paulatim magis magisque dilatantes insinuans, sanguinem venosum quidem propellere potest, ipsas vero tunicas venarum sensibilibiter nequit vibrare; nec omittendum est hoc loco, fibras omnes, tum cordis, tum arteriarum, ad motum pulsus ita esse dispositas, ut minima vis sufficiat ad illas attollendas, cum enim per totam animalis vitam ille motus continuò duraverit, non potuerunt ad illum aptissimae non reddi tam longo usu.

10 *Nulla* itaque opus est cordi *facultate attractrice*: praesertim cum nulla attractio in rerum naturâ detur, nisi attrahens rei attrahendae est affixum.

Haec ita dicta est, quod tota sanguinis moles hoc itu et reditu circum quendam singulis diebus compluries faciat, qui sanguificationi quammaximè est necessarius. |

[24]

15 Nam coctio sanguinis in Corde, non est longa ejus maceratio, tanquam carni, quae in olla vel sartagine decoquantur: sed est tantum ejus particularum artenuatio et dilatatio, qua facilius per corpus distribuatur, quod aliter quam jam descripsimus, fieri non potest. Sanguis itaque non uno per Cor transitu, sed quam plurimis coquitur reciprocationibus, in quibus modo hae, modo illae sanguinis particulae corpori alendo evadunt aptae.

20 Et nisi sanguis Circulum illum percurreret, quoniam identidem major sanguinis quantitas in Cor infunditur, quam ab alimentis suppeditatur, copiosiorque sanguis in venam arteriosam et arteriam magnam è Corde expellitur, quam ad partes alendas est necessarius, aut in alituram, ob plerarumque sanguinis arteriosi partium crassitiem, abire possit: hinc omnibus venis exhaustis, arteriisque à nimiâ sanguinis copia vel disruptis vel adeo repletis, ut venienti sanguini locus dari nequiret, necessario Cordis sanguificatio sisteretur, homoque mox interiret.

25 Hanc sanguinis circulationem quoque confirmat ocularis sanguinis in manu vel brachio etc. ascendens inspectio; atque etiam quotidiana Chirurgorum experientia, qui vinculo in aliquam partem injecto, eoque moderatè astricto animadvertunt, non citra, sed ultra vinculum venas intumescere atque illis ibidem incisis, sanguinem maximo cum impetu effluere.

Imo vena quaelibet in quacumque corporis internâ vel externâ parte ligata, semper ratione situs cordis tantum modo ultra ligaturam turgescere conspicitur.

35 Idem probant anatomici, qui ligatâ arteriâ magnâ prope Cor, eâque intra ligamentum et cordis parenchyma amputatâ, totum fere animalis sanguinem per cor brevissimo temporis spatio exhauriunt.

40 Eadem est manifesta ex modo quo cor extremos Corporis artus calore suo perfundit, qui frigore necessariò enecarentur, etiamsi cor instar ferri candentis esset ignitum, nisi circulatione hâc, per copiosissimi sanguinis recens calefacti continuam suppeditationem, incalescerent.

Ut etiam ex valvulis, quae in venis inveniuntur: Hae enim impediunt, quo minùs sanguis in pedes descendere, vel in caput ascendere queat.

DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM
SECUNDAE,

[25]

De Actionibus Naturalibus;
Pars posterior:

Resp. Ioanne Haymanno ZiriZaeo.

De Respiratione.

1. *Posteriori sanguificationi*, quam in sinistro Cordis ventriculo perfici antea diximus, inservit *respiratio*: quae est thoracis alterna dilatatio et contractio, quâ aër modo in pulmones impellitur, ad sanguinem, qui in vasis pulmonum existit, refrigerandum: modo ex iisdem cum vaporibus et fuliginibus expellitur.

5 Nisi enim sanguis per venam arteriosam è dextro Cordis ventriculo egressus ab aëre inspirato refrigeretur, et antequam sinistrum Cordis thalamum ingrediatur, rursus condensetur, non potest ignem, qui in sinistro ventriculo ardet, novo fomite conservare et nutrire. Atque ideo in hypocausto nimis calido animi deliquium patimur.

10 Hic verus *ejus usus*, primum ex eo patet, quod animalia, quibus tantum unus est Cordis sinus, etiam pulmonibus careant: et **deinde quod foetus in utero existens, ubi isto respirationis usu privatur, duos peculiare meatus praeter communes habeat, qui sponte clauduntur in lucem editis: unum, qui canaliculi instar est, per quem pars sanguinis, in dextro Cordis sinu rarefacti**, ex illo
15 **in aortam transmittitur, parte alterâ in pulmones** per venam arteriosam, quae revera est arteria, **abeunte; et alium foramen ovale dictum, valvulâque in sinistrum Cordis ventriculum spectante instructum, per quem pars sanguinis, in sinistro Cordis sinu rarefaciendi, è vena cavâ defluit, et parti alteri**, per arteriam venosam **e pulmonibus venienti, miscetur**.²⁹ Huc accedit, quod anates, buteones,
20 castores, cygni, similiaque alia animalia aquatica, quae, dum sub aquis sunt, non respirant; eandem, quam uterini aliorum animalium foetus, cordis vasorumque ejus, per totam suam vitam, habeant et servant conformationem. |

[26]

2. *Respirationis partes* duae sunt, *Inspiratio et exspiratio*.

25 *Inspiratio* est pars respirationis, quâ thorax vi musculorum inspiratoriorum dilatatus, aërem per os et nares in pulmones impellit, et sanguinem in pulmonibus existentem refrigerat.

Exspiratio est pars respirationis, quâ thorax vi musculorum expiratoriorum contractus, aërem calidiorem, et fuliginosos vapores per os et nares expellit.

30 *Aër* itaque in inspiratione pectus ingreditur, non propter fugam vacui attractus, vel sponte eo sese conferens, cum attractio vel ingressio ob illius fugam nulla detur, nec dari possit: sed quia thoracis dilatatione **vicinus aër, qui**, teste experienciâ, nec poros pectoris penetrare, nec nisi magnâ vi condensari **potest**, de loco deturbatur, ac porro alium loco movet;³⁰ et cum omnia corporibus plena sint; nec vel minimum sit vacuum in totâ rerum universitate: necessario aër à pectore et alio aëre sic

²⁹ Cf. D/R 13, ll. 46–52.

³⁰ Cf. D/R 22, ll. 2–3.

Physiologia III

pulsus, in thoracem dilatatum per asperam arteriam adigitur, ubi spatium eodem tempore fit, ad aërem qui loco hic facile deturbatur facillimè, ob suam fluiditatem, recipiendum; eodem modo, ut in follis ventilatione, aëris impulsus quotidie fieri videmus.

5 3. *Respiratio* alia *voluntaria* est, alia *naturalis*. *Voluntaria* est, quâ anima, nobis volentibus et cogitantibus, principia nervorum, inspiratoriis et expiratoriis musculis insertorum, alternatim aperit, quo spiritus animales in musculos influentes eos secundum latitudinem distendunt, pectusque vicissim dilatant et contrahunt.

10 *Respiratio naturalis* est illa, quae fit nobis animum non advertentibus (ut ex.gr. in somno), à certâ conformatione meatuum, qui sunt in partibus cerebri, à quibus thoracis nervi oriuntur; quâ nobis non cogitantibus spiritus animales copiosius influunt, modo in musculos inspiratorios, modo in expiratorios.

15 Nec mira sit illa *reciprocatio spiritus* per vices ab uno movente contingens; cum mille modis videamus alternas reciprocationes fieri posse in automatis, ab una aliqua vi perpetuo et eodem modo operante: quemadmodum spiritus à Corde in ventriculos Cerebri continuo et eodem modo influunt. |

[27]

Sic in Horologio particula illa, quae vulgo *inquies* dicitur, ob solam partium ipsius machinae conformationem, reciprocâ patitur agitationem, etsi spira ferrea, vel appensum pondus semper eodem tenore rotulas moveat.

20 Post *coctionem* sequitur *distributio*, quae est corporis alicujus contenti in varias corporis partes protrusio.

Omnis *distributio* fit vel pressione vicinarum partium, vel ebullitione aut fluiditate rei distribuendae, vel agitatione corporis contenti et continentis certo modo figurati.

25 *Separatio* est alimenti ab *excrementis* secretio. Haec motu, figura, sinu, et magnitudine, tum pororum, tum partium discernendarum peragitur; non ab *animâ*.

De Excrementis.

4. *Excrementum* est quicquid ab alimentis post coctionem separatum è corpore est excernendum. Estque vel *crassum* vel *tenuè*.

30 *Crassi excrementi* separatio fit in ventriculo et intestinis, dum, tenuioribus chyli partibus effluentibus, et tanquam cribrando expulsis, crassiores ejus partes in intestinis ob vasorum angustiam solae relinquuntur.

Est praeterea *alterum* excrementum crassum, *aurium* sc. *sordes*; quae sunt excrementum crassum, flavum, amarum, in meatu auditorio collectum.

35 5. *Excrementum tenue* est vel *liquidum* vel *vaporosum*.

Liquidum est *pituitosum*, *biliosum*, *serosum*, *lacteum*, *sanguinem*.

Pituitosum est, quod in partibus quibusdam ori vicinis, à sanguine eo impulso secretum instar pituitae è naribus vel ore excernitur. Tale est *mucus*, *sputum*, *saliva*.

40 *Biliosum* excrementum est bilis flava, quae fere tota in folliculo fellis colligitur, et redundans in intestina ejicitur, ibique cum fecibus chyli mixta, per alvum deinde expellitur.

Serosum constat particulis salsis, et aqueis. Estque *urina*, *sudor*, *lacrymae*.

De actionibus naturalibus, Pars posterior

Urina est excrementum serosum ab excrementitia bile tinctum, quod à Corde cum sanguine arterioso per arterias emulgentes in renes expulsum, ibique à sanguine separatum, per ureteres in vesicam delapsum tandem excernitur. | [28]

5 *Sudor* est excrementum serosum, quod per poros habitus corporis egrediens per cutim expellitur.

Sanguis autem cum sudore per poros non egreditur, quamvis sero sit tenuior, propterea quod partes sanguinis sint ramosae, ac idcirco magis inter se cohaereant; nec per poros ita facile effluant.

Lacrymae sunt guttae serosae ex oculis decedentes.

10 6. *Lacteum* est quod instar lactis albicat. Estque vel *mammillarum*, vel *Testium*.

Mammillarum excrementum lacteum est *lac*; quod est succus albus ex sanguine in mammillarum glandulis ad faetum alendum genitus.

15 Succus ille albus *incipit gigni* sub tempus partus, et si mammae sugantur, perdurat aliquamdiu ejus generatio: cujus causa videtur esse certa dispositio sanguinis à faetu orta, quâ aptus evadit ad poros glandularum aperiendos, iisque sese insinuandum; unde in transitu ita ejus particulae disponuntur, ut album colorem contrahant.

20 *Testium excrementum lacteum* est *semen*; quod sub tempus pubertatis à calore ea aetate sufficienter aucto, ex sanguine arterioso à Corde in meatus seminarios propulso, *gigni* incipit.

7. *Sanguineum excrementum* est *menstruum*, quod est sanguis in mulieribus superfluous, et ob caloris perfecte digerentis defectum redundans, singulis fere mensibus per uteri vasorum poros excretus.

25 *Hic sanguis* licet crudus videatur, pestilens tamen aut venenatus naturaliter non est; aliquando autem noxam, tum à diuturna mora, tum ab admixta cacochymia, contrahit.

30 Anno aetatis 13 aut decimo quarto incipiunt menstrua fluere, in praecocioribus quibusdam; at in his regionibus vulgo ante annum decimum octavum vix illud evenit. Tum enim calor aetate auctus incipit dilatare meatus circa uterum, et sanguis qui prius in nutritionem et incrementum absumebatur, incipit exuperare; nec tantum copia, sed etiam qualitate acri molestus esse: accedit quod calore attenuatus sanguis tum reddatur fluxilior.

35 *Desinunt* autem *menstrua* fluere circa annum plus minus quinquagesimum, quia ea aetate sanguis deserbit, atque etiam parcius gignitur, isque totus in nutritionem abit; *Venae* siccitate quoque angustiores redduntur, et sanguis ad poros transeundum ineptior. | [29]

40 Excernitur autem utero non per alias vias, ob solam ejus partium conformationem; ut excernimus urinam per renes et Vesicam ob eandem causam: atque etiam sanguinem per Haemorrhoides, quem etiam inter excrementa numerarem, si de aliis, quam naturalibus, hic agerem.

Fluunt autem *menstrua singulis mensibus*; quia singulis mensibus sanguis in faeminis, qualitate vel quantitate tantam noxam contrahit, quae vasa uteri ad ex-

Physiologia III

cremationem aperire potest: Huc accedit motus Lunae, qui ad menstrua movenda multum posse dicitur.

8. *Vaporosum excrementum* est, quod instar vaporis aut fumi, tum per os, aliosque patentiores meatus, tum per poros cutis perpetuo excernitur.

5 *Hoc* omnes sensibiles excretiones superat: ita ut si alimentum sumatur uno die ab lib. octo, transpiratio insensibilis, aut vaporosi excrementi soleat nonnumquam ascendere ad libras quinque: ut testatur experientia statica Sanctorii praeceptoris quondam nostri.³¹

9. *Excretio* est excrementorum separatorum exturbatio.

10 *De Nutritione et Vivificatione.*

Atque haec de *actionibus, aliturae inservientibus*, videamus nunc ejus *partes*. *Aliturae partes* duae sunt, *Nutritio et Vivificatio*.

15 10. *Nutritio* est pars aliturae, qua substantiae corporae defluxus è variis particulis sanguinis, praecipueque arteriosi, sufficienter attenuatis, et dissolutis ac per poros vasorum in partes alendas à Corde impulsis, iisque agglutinatiss et assimilatis, restauratur.

20 Sanguis enim arteriosus constat particulis diversi generis, quae varias magnitudines et figuras habent: ex his crassiores, aliis coctionibus satis attenuandae, manent in vasorum cavitatibus; quae vero justam subtilitatem sunt adeptae è poris vasorum expelluntur. Partes autem humani corporis, instar variorum cribrorum, poris magnitudine et figura variis sunt praeditae; atque hinc aliud alimentum ingreditur in ossa, aliud in carnes, aliud in alias partes; idque solo Cordis impulsu, citra magneticam vel ullam aliam attractionem.

25 Dum autem succi in minimas seu insensibiles particulas attenuati per poros partium transeunt, varie inter se uniuntur et figurantur, atque ita in eorum substantiam convertuntur. |

30 Nulla itaque necessitas cogit statuere *humorem innominatum, Rorem, Cambium, gluten* quibus alii in nutritionis explicatione utuntur. Nihil autem absurdi est partes nutriendas, quae quantae sunt, ab insensibilibus nutriri, cum et ipsae sint quantae et in minores propterea divisibiles, ac in majores componi aptae. Quod verò ex insensibilibus, fiant sensibilia, apparet in filis sericis; quorum singula filamenta seorsum visa non apparent illius coloris, simul autem juncta componunt filum aut album, aut flavum, aut alio colore tinctum.

Nutritio est aequalis, vel inaequalis.

35 *Nutritio aequalis* synecdochice *nutritio* dicitur: estque illa qua tantundem restauratur, quantum de corporis substantia fuit dissipatum.

Nutritio inaequalis est auctio et decretio.

Auctio est inaequalis nutritio, quâ plus restauratur, quam fuit dissipatum.

40 Hac corpus in longitudinem extenditur ad annum fere vigesimum primum vel secundum; quia usque ad id temporis ossa praecipuè, reliquaeque partes per

31 Cf. D/R 13, n. 9.

De actionibus naturalibus, Pars posterior

mollitiem suam extendi possunt. Accretio autem in latum et profundum etiam ad plures annos extenditur.

Decretio est nutritio defluxu minor.

5 11. *Vivificatio* est pars aliturae, quâ caloris spiritusque vitalis defluxus per generationem novi caloris, spiritusque in Corde, ejusque per corpus distributionem, restituitur. Haec ab aliis dicitur *actio vitalis*.

De Generatione.

12. Absolutâ *Aliturâ* agendum est de *Generatione*: quae est actio naturalis, quâ ex semine utriusque parentis homo procreatur.

10 Ad *generationem* requiritur concursus seminum utriusque parentis: si enim alterutrum sufficeret faemina posset per se sola procreare prolem, sed alterum alterius auxilio indiget; multa enim mixta vim obtinent quam singula non habent: ut videre est in aqua forti et sale ammoniaco, quae non nisi mixta aurum solvunt.

15 Est autem *semen* corpus liquidum, albicans, spirituosum, ex sanguine arterioso à Corde in meatus seminarios propulso genitum, rudimentum hominis generandi continens.

Rudimentum illud consistit in particulis seminis, quae talem figurationem acceperunt, ut utero receptae, mixtae, et à calore ejus agitatae, in germen, seu hominis rudem delineationem abeant.

20 *Generationi*, praeter *libidinem*, inserviunt, *Conceptio, Formatio, Partus*. | [31]

Conceptio est seminis utriusque parentis, faecundi, et ab utero temperato, beneque conformato recepti comprehensio.

13. *Formatio* est operatio generationi inserviens, quâ semen in partes et membra humana mutatur et figuratur.

25 *Haec* perficitur calore tum uteri tum seminis, quo hujus partes agitantur; *hae* autem agitatae, ob suas figuras necessario in *germen* hominis abeunt: ex quo deinde tota formatio, citra ullum animae vel alicujus corporeae facultatis intellectum, hanc dirigentem, paulatim perficitur, eo fere modo ut in officinis vitrariorum, post rudem vitreae bullae incisionem, chirothecas, ocreas, et alia ab ignatis conflari videmus.

30 Formantur una cum germine simul etiam *vasa umbilicalia, placenta et membranae foetum involventes*, quibus faetus alitur, et ab externis injuriis munitur.

Vasa umbilicalia, quae sunt quasi radix quâ faetus nutritur, implantantur *placentae*, seu hepatis uterino, quod utero agglutinatur; haec constant una *vena, duabus arteriis*, et *uracho*. *Arteriae illae duae* sunt rami seu propagines arteriae Iliacae descendentes, quibus sanguis à corde faetus in membranas et hepar uterinum pellitur. Vena vero, quae arteriis illis continua est, et venae portae est propago, sanguinem à Corde faetus impulsam et à matris utero placentae suppeditatam, venisque umbilicalibus faetus insinuatam, ad cor deducit.

40 *Urachus* à vesicae fundo ad umbilicum fertur, urinamque inter amnion et chorion ex sententia quorundam deducit: sed communiter in homine non est pervius.

Membranae, quae faetum involverunt, sunt *duae*:

Physiologia III

Una, quae *Chorion* appellatur, foetum totum ambit, et vasa jam dicta fulcit, (quae umbilicalia appellantur quia transeunt per umbilicum faetus) eorumque interventu utero tota adhaerescit.

5 *Altera* faetum proxime ambiens est *amnion*. Hae tunicae, quae in partu unam constituere videntur, *secundina* vocantur, propterea quod post faetum edantur.

14. *Formatio* potest juvari et mutari ab *imaginatione*, praecipue matris, quamdiu tenellus est faetus; quod, ut etiam docet Author Gallicae dioptricae pag. 50,³² hoc modo fit:

10 *Imago* rei visae vel cogitatae, quae realiter in Cerebro est picta, deferitur ope spirituum animalium in ventriculis Cerebri existentium | ad glandulam pinealem [32] seu conarion, et ab illa porro mediante sanguine arterioso ad uterum, et denique per vasa umbilicalia ad foetum; eo modo quo imagines rerum visibilium per longissima spacia ope globulorum visiorum, qui intermedii sunt, in charta vel oculo pinguntur, vel soni per aërem ad longissimas distantias deferuntur. Tenellus
15 autem foetus imaginem ab imaginatione fortiter impressam ob mollitiem suam facile suscipit, quae primò quidem valde parva est, sed indies cum foetu magis magisque augetur, et ita ferè absolvitur, ut in peponibus scalpello leviter in cortice signatis fieri apparet. Foetus autem tali parte, qualem mater, dum imaginabatur, tetigit, imaginem plerumque solet suspicere, quia est certa relatio membrorum
20 foetus et matris propter conjunctionem utriusque per vasa umbilicalia: motu itaque impresso pedi vel brachio ipsius matris, idem etiam inprimitur pedi vel brachio ipsius foetus.

15. *Partus* est infantis in utero geniti et perfecti seu maturi in lucem editio.

25 *Hujus* praecipua *causa* est ipse foetus, qui grandiusculus tum cibo, tum aëre indiget, et in orbem convolutus se extendere conatur, motuque suo musculos seu fibras uteri vellicat, illumque ad excretionem disponit. Nam foetu mortuo dolores partus non amplius sentiuntur: sed vel alterius generis dolor vel interdum nullus eo tempore, quo natura foetum deberet expellere, percipitur. Atque hinc concludo
30 expulsionem hanc praecipuè esse à foetu.

30 *Mirantur* multi, quomodo foetus ex utero, qui ossibus undique tam arcte clausus est, in lucem possit prodire, variasque ejus rei reddunt causas; mihi vera causa videtur potissimum esse in ipso foetu, qui nondum natus valde mollis est, atque idcirco se facile flecti et componi patitur, ut per illas angustias transire queat: huc accedit, quod partes circa uterum ex affluente copiosiore alimento valde laxae
35 evaserint.

40 *Ante dimidium annum* partum vitalem non edi experientia docet: 7°.a. mense qui nascitur, vitalis esse dicitur: 8°.v. mense natus, nullus unquam vivit secundum Hippocratem: alii tamen hunc quandoque vitalem esse statuunt: et cur non aequae aut magis vitalis sit, quam septimestris, nulla sufficiens meo iudicio ratio reddi potest. Maximè autem frequens pariendi tempus est mensis nonus.

³² *Dioptrique*, V, AT VI 129.

DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM

[33]

TERTIAE,

De Actionibus animalibus,

Pars prior.

Respond. Iacobo Blocquio Mediob.-Zeland.

1. Absolutis actionibus *Naturalibus* sequuntur *Animales*, quae non tantum à natura partium, seu naturali temperie et conformatione fiunt, sed etiam vi *animae* seu mentis perficiuntur.

Hae sunt *cogitativae*, vel *Automaticae* seu *sensitivae*.

5 Cogitativae sunt, quae nobis cogitantibus à mente exercentur.

Suntque *Intellectus* et *Voluntas*: quae hic non mentis facultates significant, sed ejus operationes.

DE INTELLECTU.

Intellectus est rerum objectarum cognitio. Estque *perceptio* et *judicium*.

10 *Perceptio* est intellectus, quo res mente percipimus. Estque inorganica et organica.

Inorganica perceptio est, quâ mens nostra sine organo ullo percipit res imagine corporeâ carentes, ut Deum, animam rationales, etc.

15 *Perceptio Organica est*, quâ mens nostra instrumento corporeo percipit res imaginationem corpoream habentes.

Haec triplex est, *sensus reflexus*, *reminiscentia*, *imaginatio*.

De Sensibus.

2. *Sensus reflexus* qui synecdochicè *Sensus* dicitur, est perceptio, quâ motus à corpore aliquo fibrillis nervorum impressus et in cerebrum delatus, ac glandulae pineali, mediantibus spiritibus animalibus, ventriculis cerebri contentis, communicatus, ab animâ in glandulâ pineali (quae sola in cerebro est unicum sensorium,) percipitur.

25 Ut autem intelligatur, quomodo motus fibrillis nervorum impressus cerebro, ac denique glandulae pineali possit communicari, sciendum est (uti optimè docet horum sacrorum Mystagogus in Gallica Dioptrica³³) I^o. quod nervi constant duabus partibus, membrana scil. | duplici, ab utraque meninge ortum habente, atque in tubulos excavata, et fibrillis tenuissimis ab ipsa cerebri substantia ortis, atque in partes sive sensoria per medios tubulos productis, iisque inclusis: 2^o. quod tubuli isti nervorum semper aliquantum à spiritibus animalibus sint inflati et distenti, ita ut inclusae fibrillae ab omni pressione liberae, si ab objectis moveantur, motum suum necessariò ad cerebrum transmittant, quemadmodum fides testudini intensa et plectro mota, ad extremos suos fines motum diffundit: 3. quod ventriculi cerebri perpetuò à spiritu animali in vigilia, instar veli vento tumidi, sint distenti: 4. quod

[34]

33 *Dioptrique*, IV, AT VI 109–114

Physiologia III

glandula pinealis, quae est in medio ventriculorum, à spiritibus animalibus undique cingatur et perfundatur. Quicumque igitur motus, fibrillis nervorum impressus, ad cerebrum diffunditur, necessario etiam contiguus spiritibus, in ventriculis cerebri existentibus, imprimatur, ac illorum ope glandulae pineali, et ibidem animae communicatur.

Itaque ad sensus movendos nullae *species intentionales*, vel *qualitates spirituales*, requiruntur, sed *solus motus ejusque varietates* sufficiunt.³⁴

Hinc etiam apparet omnes sensationes esse materiales, nullas spirituales.

Hinc etiam sequitur, quod *anima* sit quae sentiat, non *corpus*: eaque tantum quatenus est in cerebro, non quatenus est in membris, videmus enim cum ecstasi, vel profunda cogitatione anima est distracta, vel cerebrum vehementius est laesum, reliquis membris existentibus integris, corpus esse sine sensu, quamvis sint diversa objecta, quae illud moveant. Membra autem nihil aliud sunt, quàm organa sensuum exteriorum, quae tamen ipsa non sentiunt; quemadmodum baculum caeci est Organum, quo ipse Lutum, lapidem, aquam et alia percipit et dignoscit, quamvis illud nullo sensu sit praeditum.

3. Sensus fit organo externo et interno, atque hinc *sensus partes dua sunt*, sensus sc. externus et internus.

Sensus externus est pars sensus, qua anima sensoriis externis, et fibrillis nervorum ipsis insertis, objectorum motus percipit.

Sensus externus percipit Remota, ut *Visus, auditus, olfactus*: vel Admota, ut *Gustus et Tactus*.

Haec *discrimina* seu *sensuum species*, oriuntur, tum quod fibrillae | nervorum tenuitate et crassitie valde inter se differant: tum quod organa variè sunt conformata: tum quod corpora moventia, tam *objecta*, quam *media*, maximè sint varia. [35]

Hinc jam intelligimus, cur eadem ictus violentia pugno illata, si oculos, etiam in tenebris, tangat, faciat sensationem luminis variorumque colorum: si aures moveat, exhibeat sensationem alicujus soni: si alias corporis partes, excitet dolorem.

Hinc etiam manifestum est, cur Color non possit audiri, nec sonus videri.

4. *Visus* est sensus externus, quo ex motu fibrillarum nervi optici in cerebrum delato, anima *Lumen, colorem, situm, distantiam, magnitudinem et figuram* rerum objectarum percipit.

Lumen est impulsus, quo globuli aetherei à luce per intervalla corporum diaphanorum propelluntur.

Lux est celerrimus motus aut pressio corporum Lucidorum, quo perpetuò globulos aethereos undique circum se ad lineam rectam premunt per intervalla corporum diaphanorum.

Corpora lucida sunt corpora *luce* praedita: vel (ut magis me explicem) sunt corpora, quorum minimae particulae celerrimo motu agitatae, globulos aethereos ad Lineam rectam propellunt, tale est ferrum candens, carbo ignitus, candela

³⁴ *Dioptrique*, I, AT VI 85.

ardens, Sol, etc.

Globuli aetherei sunt subtilissima quaedam corpuscula, aëre multo subtiliora, quibus spaciola illa, quae sunt inter particulas aquae, terrae et aëris, et spatium illud ingens, quod est à supremo aëre ad solem isque sine ulla interruptione sunt repleta.

Lineae istae rectae, secundam quas globuli isti premuntur sunt *radii Lucis*.

Pressio ista globulorum aethereorum non ita intelligenda est, quasi globulus rei lucidae proximus pellatur usque ad rem illustrandam, ut Lucretius existimavit, cum dixit *Lucida tela diei*, item *spicula solis*³⁵: hoc enim si fieret, sol jam diu suos radios vel spicula perdidisset; nec visio fieret, in momento. Sed cum à re lucidâ usque ad corpus illustrandum, omnia intervalla diaphani intermedii istis globulis plena sint, omnes per continuationem à primo atque ad ultimum uno momento propelluntur: eodem modo, ut coeco Lapidem, lutum vel aquam baculo attingente, motus in momento nervis ipsius manus, et | deinde cerebro communicatur.

Hinc manifestum est, quomodo sol et astra longissimè à nobis distantia in instanti videri queant.

Corpora Diaphana sunt corpora globulis aethereis pervia, quorum superficies tum exterior tum interior in contactu globulorum sufficientem habet laevitatem, ad tantam radiorum copiam, eamque eo modo ad oculum transmittendam, ut lineamenta et colores objectorum commode possint percipi.

Itaque pro diaphano hic non habetur corpus, quod solummodo aliquos lucis radios transmittit, ut charta alba, nubes etc.

In Diaphano requiritur I°. ut corpus globulis aethereis sit pervium, quo illi ad visum excitandum à re Lucida in oculum possint propelli. 2°. Laevitas superficiei exterioris in diaphano requiritur, ut apparet in vitro, cujus alterutra vel utraque superficies arena vel adamante est asperata. Radii enim in illud incidentes propter asperitatem ita dissiliunt, ut oculis nostris imagines rerum imprimi non possint. 3°. Ut interior superficies diaphani, per quod transeunt globuli, in toto pororum ductu sit laevis et aequalis, ne radii in asperitatem incidentes resiliant, atque ita ab oculo avertantur: ut probatur experimento parietis satis crassi, foramineque non recto sed curvo perforati, qui perspicuus non est, nisi in curvatura foraminis certo loco speculum collocetur.

5. *Lumen est Transiens vel Rediens*.

Non distribuo lumen in *directum*, *reflexum* et *Refractum*, quia partes hae non sunt oppositae: nam reflexum lumen saepe etiam est directum, cum scil. perpendiculariter in corpus à quo reflectitur, incidit.

Transiens lumen est, quod à corpore lucido per apertos diaphani poros propellitur. Estque directum vel refractum.

Directum est, quod recta linea per diaphanum protruditur: quod fit, cum luminis est *una tantum determinatio*.

³⁵ *De rerum natura*, VI, 39–41: hunc igitur terrorem animi tenebrasque necessest / non radii solis nec lucida tela diei/ discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque. The phrase *spicula solis* is not found in Lucretius' work.

Physiologia III

Refractum est, quod angulari linea per diaphana movetur: hoc oritur ex *gemina* luminis *determinatione*, quarum altera acceleratur vel retardatur, alterâ manente immutatâ.

5 *Rediens lumen* est, quod à corpore objecto, per quod transire nequit, resilit. Estque *reciprocans* vel *deflectens*. | [37]

Reciprocans est, quod eâdem redit viâ, quâ processit: quod fit ob *unam* luminis *determinationem*.

10 *Deflectens lumen* est, quod in reditu à via recedit, qua fuit motum; idque vel *in unam partem*, ut fit cum radii incidunt in corpus politum; vel *in varias partes*, quod fit ob corporis objecti asperitatem. *Deflexio luminis* oritur à *duabus* luminis *determinationibus*, quarum altera mutatur.

15 6. *Color* (propriè loquendo) est globulorum aethereorum perceptibilis in lumine processus et circumvolutionis proportio. Quoniam à certa quaedam partium, rem aliquam constituentium, dispositio proportionem illam per reflexionem vel refractionem radiorum gignere solet; et vera coloris natura à plerisque hactenus non est satis cognita, idcirco ipsis corporibus proportionem illam excitare, et praecipuè per reflexionem aptis, vulgo color adscribi consuevit; atque ideò *ille* per metonymiam causae definiri etiam potest: Dispositio partium corporis, à qua globulorum aethereorum in id incidentium certa processus et circumvolutionis oritur
20 proportio.

Colores praecipui sunt *Albus, Ruber, Flavus, viridis, coeruleus*: reliqui colores ex his facile intelliguntur.

25 *Albus* est, cum globulum aetherei aequaliter propelluntur et circum centrum suum rotantur.

Ruber, cum globuli aetherei multo celerius circum suum centrum rotantur, quae ad lineam rectam procedunt.

Flavus est, quando globuli aetherei paulo celerius circumgyrantur, quam propelluntur.

30 *Coeruleus*, cum illi multo tardius rotantur, quam recta procedunt.

Viridis, cum illi paulo tardius circumgyrantur quam ad lineam rectam procedunt.

35 ***Nigredo etiam inter colores censi solet; sed illa nihil aliud est, quam certa dispositio*** partium insensibilium corporis, à qua impulsorum globulorum aethereorum motus sistitur.³⁶

Horum omnium ratio intelligitur ex coloribus variis, qui primate vel globo vitreo, item guttis aqueis aliisque naturâ vel arte produci solent, ut videre est in dioptrica Gallica discursu octavo.³⁷ Distinctio autem colorum, in *veros* et *falsos* seu *apparentes*, est rejicienda: cum omnes apparentes dicti sint veri; et veri appellati, quotiescunque sunt conspicui, sint apparentes. | [38]

40 7. Ut locus rerum tangibilium manibus: sic visibilium *situs* ab Animâ, sine ullis speciebus, oculis percipitur; *primò* per radiorum versus certas cerebri partes

³⁶ Cf. D/R 19B, II. 48–49.

³⁷ The reference is probably not to *Dioptrique*, VIII, but to *Météores*, VIII (BITBOL-HESPÉRIES 1993, 61).

ex aliquâ regione determinatorum impulsum; et *deinde* ex impulsus istius modo seu vehementiâ, quâ tota radiorum extensio quodammodo innotescit; ac *denique* ex partium cerebri, unde nervi visorii originem ducunt, ab objectis motarum tali positione, qua anima ad certum locum, cumque vel unum vel plures attendere solebat. Atque ideo, cum neuter oculorum per vim à naturali situ est detortus, licet geminae, et quidem eversae, teste autopsiâ, in fundis oculorum pingantur imagines; res tamen simplex, erecta et foris suo loco sita percipitur. Contra vero, ubi per vim alteruter cum cerebri annexâ parte à justo cum altero paralelismo est deturbatus, omnia gemina apparent. Eodem modo ut coecus duabus manibus eandem rem contrectans, eam judicat esse simplicem; decussatisque baculis objecta varia contingens, sinistrâ manu dextrum, et dextrâ sinistrum, et utrumque certo loco situm percipit, et per totam baculorum longitudinem mentis attentionem ex impulsus modo dirigit; ejusdem verò manus indice et medio digito sibi mutuo decussatim insidentibus, si unicum globulum inter utrumque circumvolvât, eum non unum, sed geminum censet.

8. *Distantia cognoscitur*; I. ex figuratione oculi; nam aliter figuratur oculus in percipiendis objectis propinquis, quam longinquis: 2. ex oculorum inter se situ, item ex diverso situ unius oculi in diversis stationibus: 3. ex distincta vel confusa objecti repraesentatione: 4. Ex fortitudine vel imbellicitate luminis.

Modus videndi magnitudinem est comprehensus in perceptione situs et distantiae: nam magnitudo aestimatur ex opinione distantiae comparatae cum magnitudine imaginis quae est in fundo oculi; et non absolutè ex magnitudine imaginum.

Figura judicatur ex opinione situs diversarum particularum corporis objecti; et non ex similitudine imaginum, quae sunt in fundo oculi, cum objecto: illae enim sunt plerumque elipses et quadrata oblonga, cum nobis circulos et quadrata aequilatera exhibent.

9. *Visus fit Oculo*, qui I. constat aliquibus *partibus diaphanis*, nempe tunica cornea, et humoribus, aqueo, chrySTALLINO et vitreo; ut sc. radii ad fibrillas retinae sive nervi optici movendas pertingere possint. |

2° *Est convexus*, ut radii istâ convexitate uniantur et congregentur, atque ita uniti vim habeant, quae fibrillas nervi optici movere sufficiat. Habet autem convexitas oculi talem proportionem ad retinam, ut radii in oculum incidentes, in fundo oculi, ubi retina est, ad certa puncta congregentur: nam si concursus ille radiorum fieret ante vel post retinam, nulla vel obscura fieret visio.

3° Constat *uveâ tunicâ*, cujus exterior superficies ob varium colorem Iris dicitur. Haec in medio pertusa est foramine quodam pupilla dicto, quod in ejus medio pupula insipientibus appareat. Haec tunica habet hanc vim, ut instar muscoli se dilatando et contrahendo papillam latiore vel angustiore reddat, ad moderandum sc. radiorum ingressum, qui modo sunt plures, modo pauciores; modo fortes; modo imbellices. *Hujus* tunicae interior superficies nigrore quodam, instar uvae nigrae, est obducta; ut radii in retinam incidentes, atque deinde in uveam resilientes, ibidem extinguantur, ne iterum reverberati in retinam, visum

41 uvae] unae *Phys.*

Physiologia III

perturbent.

4° In oculo est *tunica arachnoides*, in cuius medio haeret *lens* chrySTALLINI humoris, ut araneus in telae suae centro, quae vim habet ope *processuum ciliarium* tamquam parvis musculis aut tendinibus, *chrySTALLINUM humorem* (in quo
5 ob densitatem praecipua fit radiorum refractio et versus retinam unio) vel propius vel remotius à retina movendi, eumque, ut et totum oculum, vel magis vel minus convexum efficiendi, prout distantia major vel minor objecti requirit.

5° Denique in fundo oculi est membrana reticularis seu *retina*, quae contexta est ex infinitis fibrillis nervi optici; haec à radiis auxilio convexitatis oculi et
10 praecipuè humoris crystallini collectis, moventur, motumque qualem acceperunt (quia extremitates nervi optici, ex quibus retina praecipuè constat, sunt albae) cerebro atque animae communicant et offerunt, atque ita sensationem visibilium efficiunt.

In visione requiritur *intermedium corpus* diaphanum, ob oculi conformationem jam propositam.
15

Haec autem, quae à me de oculo et ratione videndi sunt dicta, optime in cubiculo obscuro, unico foramine per lentem chrySTALLINAM lumen in chartâ albâ justo loco adhibitâ, recipiente, demonstrari possunt.

10. *Auditus* est sensus externus, quo ex motu fibrillarum nervi auditorii in
20 cerebrum delato anima sonos percipit. [40]

Sonus est motus tremulus particularum aëris, nervum auditorium movere aptus. Cujus celeritas *acutum*, tarditas gravem *sonum* efficit: ut patet in fidium testudinis percussione.

Visus fit motu globulorum aethereorum, qui cum sint solidi, in se non consistunt: *Auditus* verò motu aëris, cuius particulae ramosae in se flectuntur, unde hic
25 viso, qui in instanti fit, est tardior.

In *Auditu* requiritur corpus *intermedium* inter rem sonoram et aurem, ut partes aëris possint disponi ad diversas tremulationes efficiendas, quae diversos sonos efficiunt.

Auditus organum exterius est *excavatum* et *latum* instar infundibuli, ut aër motus tanto copiosius in meatum auditorium veniat, nervumque auditorium sufficienter afficiat.
30

11. *Odoratus* est sensus externus, quo ex motu fibrillarum nervi odoratorii anima in cerebro odores percipit.

Odor est halitus quidam ex re odorifera in nares exhalans, nervum odoratorium
35 naribus insertum certo modo movere habilis.

Etiam hic *multitudo halituum* ob eorum subtilitatem requiritur, quae cavitate narium collecta odoratum excitare possit.

In odoratu nostro requiritur *aër medius* inter rem odorificam, et nervum odoratorium, ut particulae odoriferae possint à se mutuo, separari, quemadmodum
40 sagittae ad laedendum ex pharetra emitti, separarique debent.

Gustus est sensus externus, quo ex motu nervi gustarii linguae inserti, anima sapores percipit.

De actionibus animalibus, Pars prior

Sapor est dispositio certa insensibilium particularum rem sapidam constituentium, quae apta est movere certo modo nervos gustatorios.

Tactus est sensus externus, quo ex motu nervorum tacteriorum imaginitudinem, situm, figuram, motum et quietem rerum tangibilium percipimus.

5 Hi duo postremi sensus *non requirunt intermedium corpus, nec cavitatem in organo*: quia objecta eorum satis validè agunt, tum ob crassitiem suam, tum quia corpori proximè applicantur.

10 12. Post *sensus externos* sequitur *Internus*, qui est pars sensus, qua anima ex glandulae pinealis, tanquam communis instrumenti, motu, omnes motus objectorum à quinque sensibus oblatos percipit et dignoscit, atque ideo vocatur *sensus communis*.



DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM

TERTIAE,

De ACTIONIBUS

ANIMALIBUS,

PARS POSTERIOR;

QUAM

Divino annuente Numine,

SUB PRAESIDIO

Clarissimi Medici et Philosophi,

D. HENRICI REGII,

Medicinae et Botanices Professoris ordinarii,

Publicè, in almâ Ultrajectinâ Academiâ

examinandam proponit,

JOHANNES de RAEI Gelrus.

Ad diem 30. Iunii.

ULTRAIECTI,

Ex Officina *AEgidii Roman*, Academiae

Typographi, Anno 1641.

CLARISSIMO ERUDITISSI-
MOQUE VIRO,

D. HENRICO REGIO,

Reipubl. Ultrjectinae Medico, ac in
almo ejusdem Athenaeo Medicinae
ac Botanices Professore solidissimo,
de studiis meis, quâ publicè, quâ pri-
vatim, optimè merito, et etiam-
num merenti,

*Hoc exercitium Academicum, tanquam
grati animi τεκμηριον*

D.D.D.

IOHANNES de RAEI
Resp.

DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM

[41]

TERTIAE,

De Actionibus animalibus,
pars Posterior.

Resp. Iohanne de Raei.

1. Omnium sensuum affectiones sunt *Voluptas* et *Dolor*. *Voluptas* est grati motus sensio. *Dolor* contra est motus ingrati et praecipuè vehementioris perceptio.

2. *Sensus* nostri *falluntur* cum organum est vitiatum, aut medium ineptum; aut objectum nimis vehementer vel leniter agit; aut justo intervallo non est dissitum; aut simile aliquod requisitum sentiendi deest. Si nulla harum conditionum deficit, *nulla fit sensuum fallacia*.

De Somno et Vigiliâ.

3. *Sensus* peragitur in *Vigilia*, cessat in *Somno*.

Vigilia est dilatatio ventriculorum cerebri et nervorum à sufficiente copia et motu spirituum animalium, quibus sensoria à pressione libera evadunt ad motus objectorum animae offerendos.

Quaecunque igitur vel attenuando aut calefaciendo sanguinem, vel aperiendo poros carotidum arteriarum, vel vehementius corpus agitando, vel moderate quiescendo, vel quovis alio modo spiritus augent, aut fortius movent, *illa vigiliâs inducunt*.

Somnus est ventriculorum cerebri et nervorum subsidentia, à deficiente justo motu vel copia spirituum animalium, quibus sensoria sistuntur, et inepta fiunt ad motus objectorum animae repraesentandos.

Quaecunque igitur vel incrassando, vel refrigerando sanguinem, vel poros carotidum claudendo, vel dissipando spiritus, vel quovis alio modo copiam vel motum spirituum impediunt, *illa somnum conciliant*.

Hinc jam intelligimus, quomodus somnus inducatur à pluribus et differentibus causis, ut longis vigiliis, labore et defatigatione, immodico tum calore tum frigore, nimia evacuatione, molli frictione, leni cunarum agitatione, murmure aquarum, cantu, tenebris, silentio, solitudine, otio, lectione non admodum attenta, usu frigidi aut humidi alimenti vel medicamenti, quale dicitur esse opium, ventriculorum cerebri compressione. |

[42]

De Reminiscentia et Imaginatione.

4. *Reminiscentia* est perceptio, qua res anteâ perceptae per vestigia cerebro impressa mediantibus spiritibus animalibus animae rursus repraesentantur.

5. *Reminiscentia et imaginationi* inservit *Memoria*, quae est vestigiorum ab objectorum motu cerebro impressorum retentio. Nisi enim rerum vestigia cerebro impressa in eo aliquamdiu retineantur, nullius rei possumus reminisci.

Memoria pro cerebri constitutione vel est firmior vel debilior.

Physiologia III

6. *Imaginatio* est perceptio, qua è vestigiorum cerebri varia mutatione, vel spirituum animalium certa dispositione novae imagines gignuntur, animaeque offeruntur.

5 *Mutatio illa* fit, dum vestigia vel composita, vel separata vel detorta obijciuntur.

Spirituum verò illa *dispositio* oritur ex certo eorum in vestigia cerebri impulsu et resultu.

10 *Perceptio universalium* ad imaginationem pertinet.³⁸ *Universalialia* enim sunt singularia in abstracto considerata sine notis individuationis hoc, hic, nunc, ut loquuntur scholastici. Itaque haec fiunt per imaginatorem, quae detrahit.

Imaginatio est vel *vigilantium* et vocatur synechd. *phantasia*, vel dormientium, et vocatur *Insomnium*.

15 *Phantasia* est vigilantium imaginatio, quae homini vigilanti perpetuo oboritur, à motu glandulae pinealis, quae in vigilia, vel sponte ab anima, vel fortuito ab arteriis carotidibus eam involventibus, agitur: et mediantibus spiritibus animalibus in vestigia cerebri impressa impellitur: vel à novis imaginibus ex motu spirituum animalium recens genitis, movetur.

20 *Insomnium* est dormientium imaginatio, quae in somno oboritur, cum glandula pinealis, ob spiritus animales satis copiose in cerebro nascentes à subsidia cerebri libera ab arteriis in vestigia ejus impellitur, vel ipse imagines sive cerebro impressae, sive recens ex spirituum agitatione genitae glandulae, imprimuntur.

25 *Variae* sunt *phantasia* et *insomnia* pro varietate *vestigiorum* cerebro impressorum vel *temperamenti*, quo spiritus apti sunt diversimode figurari, aut sensoria interna movere; vel *Consuetudinis*, qua glandula | in has vel illas imagines cerebri [43] magis vel minus solet propendere.

De Iudicio.

7. Atque haec de *perceptione*; sequitur *judicium*, quod est Intellectus, quo anima naturas, circumstantias atque accidentia rerum perceptarum perpendit et dijudicat.

30 *Circumstantiae rerum* objectarum sunt verum, falsum; utile, inutile; jucundum, honestum, etcetera.

35 *Quemadmodum* autem anima corporeo utitur organo ad quasdam perceptiones perficiendas: ita omne iudicium à mente sine corpore tanquam organo peragitur. Nec refert, quod cerebro male affecto iudicium laedatur; hinc enim solummodo sequitur, mentem corpore sano indigere, quamdiu illi unita est, ut ab ipso in operationibus suis non impediatur; non autem eo uti tanquam organo vel instrumento ad recte iudicandum.

Judicii partes duae sunt: *Perpensio* et *Decisio*.

Perpensio est rei perceptae et circumstantiarum considerata examinatio.

40 *Haec*, nisi accurata et exacta fuerit, **facile** in decidendo committitur error.³⁹

38 Cf. D/R 23, ll. 1–3.

39 Cf. D/R 19B, ll. 50–51.

De actionibus animalibus, Pars posterior

Decisio est de re percepta et perpensa sententiae prolatio. Estque affirmativa vel negativa.

5 **Atque haec**⁴⁰ potest *suspendi* vel *proferri liberè* seu citra coactionem, aut contra arbitrium nostrum, in quo tota ejus *libertas* consistit: quamvis non opus sit nos in utramque partem ferri. Et certe, quo magis determinati sumus, sive ex perceptione sive perpensione propria, sive ex illustratione divina, tantò liberior est decisio.

Iudicium aliud est vacillans, aliud firmum: aliud rectum aliud fallax.

10 *Rectum* est, quod iudicat de rebus clare et distinctè perceptis secundum rectam rationem nobis insitam: *fallax*, contra.

De Affectibus.

8. Iudicium saepè comitem habet *Affectum*, qui est impetus, quo anima ab opinione objecti boni vel mali diversimode affecta, spiritus animales ope *conaris* variè per nervos in cor ejusque vasa propellit; quo illa plus solito vel constringuntur, 15 vel dilatantur, sanguisque vel parcius vel copiosius per corpus distribuitur, unde totum corpus deinde variè perturbatur.

Tum comitatur *affectus* iudicium, cùm spiritus in percipiendo vel | dijudicando [44] vel plus vel minus justò, vel indebitè agitantur.

20 ***Affectuum, quatenus ad corpus spectant, sedes praecipua est in Corde; quoniam hoc praecipue ab illis alteratur: sed quatenus etiam mentem afficiunt, est tantum in cerebro, quoniam ab illo solo Mens immediate pati potest.***⁴¹

Affectus praecipui numerantur amor, odium, laetitia, tristitia, spes, desperatio, timor, audacia, ira. Sed si rem bene perpendamus, haec sunt tantum varia iudicia et voluntates, affectibus laetitiae et tristitiae comitata.

25 *Affectus* itaque est tantum duplex: *Laetitia* et *Tristitia*.⁴²

Laetitia est *Affectus*, quo anima ex iudicio objecti boni voluptate quadam affecta cor vehementius dilatatur, sanguinemque et spiritus copiosius per corpus propellit.

30 *Tristitia* est *Affectus*, quo anima ex iudicio objecti mali dolore quadam affecta, cor constringit, sanguinemque et spiritus parcius per corpus distribuit.

9. Iudicii modus est *Noeticus* et *Dianoeticus*.

Noeticus, quo mens axiomata dispositione rem dijudicat.

Dianoeticus, quo mens ab uno axioma ad aliud discurrit, et ex collatione diversorum aliquid colligit.

35 Estque *Ratiocinatio* vel *Ordinatio*.

Ratiocinatio sive syllogismus est, quo mens ex trium notionum collatione consequentiam infert, unde quid consequens, quidque inconsequens sit dijudicat.

40 *Ordinatio* sive Methodus est, qua mens per plures è notionibus compositas sententias discurrunt, eas sibi mutuo homogeneas pro naturae suae claritate proponit, et in ordinem redigit; unde ordinis et confusionis iudicium consequitur.

40 Cf. D/R 19B, ll. 51–54.

41 Cf. D/R 19B, ll. 59–62.

42 Cf. D/R 23, ll. 3–6.

Physiologia III

Atque haec de intellectu seu intellectione dicta sint.

DE VOLUNTATE.

10. *Voluntas* est libera, non coacta rerum, quas intelligimus esse bonas, amplexio; et quas malas esse novimus, rejectio.

5 Atque haec *Amplexio Volitio*, *Rejectio* autem *Nolitio* dicitur.

Itaque voluntas semper ex intellectione oritur, et ejus nutum sequitur, nec quicquam volumus, quod jam antea, saltem ex opinione nostrâ, non cognovimus.

10 *Neque* propterea leges divinae et humanae sunt injustae: hae enim | propositis [45] virtuti praemiis, et sceleri poenis, efficiunt ut res vel bonas vel malas judicemus; ac proinde eas vel prosequamur vel vitemus.

Nec etiam obstat, quod saepè ante rerum cognitionem res cognoscere, imo et velle velimus: nam hoc non fit, nisi illud ipsum *cognoscere* et *velle* jam antea nobis sit oblatum, et à mente intellectum.

15 *Amplectimur* autem et *rejjicimus* res cognitatas vel *solo animo*, vel *animo simul et corpore*.

11. Atque huic posteriori voluntatis modo inservit *motus arbitrarius*, quo corpus nostrum pro mentis arbitrio, ad res prosequendas vel fugiendas de loco in locum transfertur.

Hic duobus perficitur instrumentis *spiritu animali* et *musculis*.

20 *Spiritus animalis* in ventriculis cerebri perpetuo moventur, sed tamen ut plurimum parent animae imperio, quae illorum motum in hanc vel illam partem determinat: nam quaelibet animo agitare, et quamvis corporis partem pro libitu movere possumus.

25 *Itaque* in motu voluntario ab anima nullus excitatur novus motus, sed tantum spirituum in hanc vel illam partem determinatio, qui à subtili seu aetherea materia agitati, quantum motus partibus communicant, tantundem ipsi perdunt.

Spiritus autem *animales* per nervos in *musculos* sufficienti copia ab anima vi glandulae pinealis missi, ipsos secundum latitudinem distendunt, secundum longitudinem vero contrahunt, atque hinc pars, cui illi inseruntur, necessariò movetur.

30 *Musculus* constat carne venis, arteriis, nervo in vaginam dilatato et valvulis instructo, ac tendine quae omnia membranae tamquam vesicae includuntur, atque hinc spiritus animalis per nervum immissus, egredique non potens, necessariò musculum inflando contrahit, partemque cui est annexus, movet.

35 *Spiritus* autem ad motum musculorum necessarii, non omnes singulis alternatis motibus recens à ventriculis cerebri subministrantur: hoc enim si fieret cerebrum in omnibus majorum musculorum inflationibus, necessariò totum concideret: sed singula musculorum paria, eo loci, ubi originem capiunt, sunt contigua, communemque habent nervum et valvulam. *Itaque* in singulis motuum vicissitudinibus, spiritus animales diverso modo ab anima vel alia causa determinati, ab
40 uno musculo in alterum transeunt: Atque ita hi cum paucis à cerebro recenter af-

31 tamquam] tamque *Phys.*

De actionibus animalibus, Pars posterior

fluentibus ad quosvis etiam vehementiores et satis diu- | turnos motus perficiendos [46]
sufficere possunt.

DE ACTIONIBUS AUTOMATICIS.

5 12. Expositis actionibus *cogitativis* aggrediamur *Automaticas*, quae anima seu
mente ad rem non attendente per solum organorum animalium, nempe spirituum,
nervorum, cerebri, aut musculorum, ab objecto externo vel interno agitatorum
motum ab homine tanquam aliquo automato peraguntur.

Hujusmodi actiones ex. gr. inter ambulandum et attentius colloquendum in
nobis observantur, ubi inscii spiritum ducimus, pedes movemus, et nonnunquam
10 etiam salutantes aperto capite resalutamus.

*Actiones automaticae sunt Receptio, Appetitus sensitivus simplex, et Motus
spontaneus.*

**Receptio est actio (vel potius passio) animalis automatica, qua motus
rerum recipimus. Hic enim ad omnia, quae in homine peraguntur, sub
15 uno genere comprehendenda, passiones cum actionibus conjunximus.**⁴³ Haec
triplex est *sensus simplex, Reminiscentia simplex, Imaginatio simplex.*

Sunt, qui *Aestimativam* his addi volunt, quam bestiis etiam tribuunt: sed *haec*
ad iudicium est referenda; nisi bestiis animam rationalem velimus tribuere.

20 *Sensus simplex* est receptio, qua motus à corpore aliquo fibrillis nervorum im-
pressus, et in cerebrum delatus, tandem conario, mediantibus spiritibus animalibus
communicatur.

Atque hinc *sensus simplicis duae partes* sunt, *sensus externus* et *internus*.

Sensus externus est pars *sensus simplicis*, qua à sensoriis externis et fibrillis
nervorum ipsis insertis objectorum motus recipiuntur.

25 Estque quintuplex *Visus, Auditus, Gustus, Olfactus, Tactus.*

Visus simplex est *sensus simplex externus*, quo talis motus fibrillis nervi optici
imprimitur, et in cerebrum defertur, quo anima, si attenderet, lumen colorem, situm,
distantiam, magnitudinem et figuram rerum objectarum posset percipere.

30 *Auditus simplex* est *sensus simplex externus*, quo talis motus fibrillis nervi au-
ditorii imprimitur et in cerebrum defertur, quo anima si attenderet, sonos perciperet.

Gustus simplex est *sensus simplex externus*, quo talis motus fibrillis nervi
gustatorii et cerebro imprimitur, quo anima ad rem attendens sapes cognosceret. | [47]

Olfactus simplex est *sensus externus*, quo talis motus nervis odoratoriis et
cerebro imprimitur, quo anima attendens odores perciperet.

35 *Tactus simplex* est *sensus externus simplex*, quo talis motus nervis tactoriis et
cerebro imprimitur, quo mens humana rei intenta, magnitudinem, situm, motum,
quietem et figuram rerum tangibilium percipit.

40 *Sensus internus simplex* unus est, nempe *sensus communis simplex*, qui est
pars *sensus*, qua glandula pinealis, tamquam commune instrumentum, omnes
motus objectorum à quinque sensibus oblatos recipit.

43 Cf. D/R 19B, ll. 63–68.

Physiologia III

Reminiscentia simplex est receptio, qua motus rerum antea perceptarum per vestigia cerebro impressa, glandulae pineali iterum offeruntur.

Huic etiam inservit *memoria*, de qua in doctrina de *perceptione* dictum est.

Imaginatio simplex est receptio, qua è vestigiorum cerebri varia mutatione vel spirituum animalium certa dispositione, novae imagines producuntur glandulaeque pineali offeruntur. Haec est *phantasia* vel *insomnium simplex*. *Appetitus sensitivus simplex* est motus quidam spirituum à receptione excitatus, quo meatus quidam nervorum ad apertionem vel clausionem vellicantur, unde ad certam aliquam rem vel assequendam vel fugiendam sumus proclives, saepe etiam inscii et inviti. Hunc saepe comitatur *Affectus sensitivus*, qui est perturbatio corporis à motu spirituum à receptione orto originem ducens, qua cor plus solito vel contrahitur reliquumque corpus variè afficitur.

Motus spontaneus est motus à receptione excitatus, quo spiritus ita moventur, ut certos quosdam meatus nervorum aperiant, quo fit, ut spiritus influentes, has vel illas partes moveant, saepe etiam nobis insciis, imo etiam invitis, eo fere modo ut in automatis pneumaticis et hydraulicis contingit.

DE SANITATE ACCURATA ET DEFLECTENTE.

13. Atque haec de *Actionibus humanis*, quae praecipua sunt signa quibus sanitas cognoscitur: progrediamur ad *sanitatis species*, quae statuuntur vulgò duae: *Accurata*, et *Deflectens*.

Sanitas accurata est, qua ad actiones accuratè perficiendas sumus apti.

Itaque in hac *actiones* sunt perfectissimae: ac primum actiones animales in motu et sensu sunt integrae; insomnia levia et jucunda: somnus et vigilia, appetitus et affectus, pulsus et respiratio, omnia suae moderata, beneque temperata. [48]

Coctiones et excretiones sunt tempestivae, excrementa nec quantitate, nec qualitate admodum molesta.

Alvi dejectio inter durum et fluidum media, bile paulum tincta, quantitate proportionatâ assumptis cibis respondens.

Urina consistentiâ est mediocri, clara, pellucida, pura, subaurea, hypostasin habens albam, laevem et aequalem, in auctum fastigiatam, potui quantitate congruens.

Corpus nulla aliena qualitate est praeditum, color cutis est floridus, et quasi ex rubro et albo mixtus.

Capilli in vigore aetatis inter Europaeos ferè flavi, in puerili fulvi densitate et tenuitate moderati, et inter crispis et rectos medii.

Corpus pulchrum et dignitate summa praeditum, difficulter ab externis injuriis offenditur, et aequaliter se habet ad omnes excessus, qui ex anni tempestatibus, aut diaetae erroribus oriuntur.

14. *Sanitas deflectens* est, quae ab accurata decedit.

Hujus *signa* sunt actiones à perfectione deflectentes. Estque *firma* vel *vacillans*.

Deflectens firma est, quae quamvis à perfecta decedat, apta tamen est actiones

De actionibus animalibus, Pars posterior

satis firmas et validas edere.

Firma Deflectens vel Temperie vel Confirmatione deflectit.

In temperie Deflectente vulgò maximè observari solet illa, quae vel ad *calidum* vel *frigidum* recedit.

5 *Qui ad Calidum deflectunt* ad iram sunt proniores, pulsus temperatis habent majores et frequentiores, uti et respirationem. In infantia tempestivè dentunt, crescunt, et tempestivius articulatè loquuntur.

10 Dura et valida alimenta facile coquunt; urinam et alvi faeces coloratiores dejiciunt, ad venerem maturè sunt procliviores, masculos gignunt; corpus eorum in contactu sentitur calidius, color ipsis est rubriendus, pili nigri et densi; gracile est illis corpus et adipis expers, citò etiam incalescunt.

15 *Si ad calorem accedat Humiditas*, sensus habent hebetiores, et motus temperatis tardiores, insomnia frequentia, ad iram sunt proclives, non tamen feri, pulsus in ipsis sunt molles, sanguis redundat; facilis est veneris tolerantia, semen habent multum, quod cito excernunt, excrementa in illis sunt copiosa, moderate cocta; colore sunt sanguineo, corpore molli et temperatis carnosiore, capillis subflavis, rectis, planis, crassis, mollibus. [49]

20 *Temperamentum si ad Calidum et siccum Deflectat*, motus corporis est perfectus, mobilitatem habent in opinionibus, motus celeritatem, somnos leves brevesque, insomnia ignea, ingenium velox, audaciam, temeritatem, in venerem proclivitatem, qua tamen citò satiantur; vox est clara, asperaque, coctio validior; excrementis abundant paucis: semen ipsis est paucum, densum, crassum, globulosum, fervens, quod tarde excernunt, corpore sunt hirsuti, capilli illis sunt copiosi, colore nigri, tempestivior his est calvities, corpus est firmum, articulatum, musculosum et pinguedinis expers, cutis dura et subnigra.

25 *In Deflectente frigida temperie* pulsus temperatis sunt minores, et respiratio huic analoga, timidi sunt et ad actiones segnes, ad iram tardi, veneremque minus appetunt, nec sensibus admodum valent, corpus tactui frigidius temperato apparet; cutis rusa, et si frigus multum excesserit, livida, glabra, capillus rufus, adeps per carnes sparsa, capilli multi post natalem oriuntur tenues, canescentes tandem; qui tamen non facile calvescunt.

30 *Temperiei frigidae humidae deflectentis signa* sunt sensus obtusiores, motus tardiores, somnolentia ac somnus gravis ac profundus, pulsus hic sunt molles ac parvi, irae minima tenacitas, excrementa multa, semen tenue, aquosum, candicans, spumosum, frigidiusculum, foemelas gignens, corpus etiam est molle, laxum, rarum, pili per corpus albicantes, mollissimi ac planissimi.

35 *Deflectentem frigidam siccam temperiem indicant* corpus duriusculum, tenue, sensus in juventute tantum vigentes, respiratio ac pulsus tardiores ac rariores; ad iram coacti difficulter placantur, sanguis his parcus est et semen paucum.

40 *Deflectens sanitas secundum Conformationem* fere raro et denso corpore contineri dicitur. Qui rari sunt corpore, maximam partem calidiores humidioresque existunt, tactu sunt molles, ac levi exercitatione sudantes, atque laboribus cito exsolvuntur, externisque facile offenduntur.

Physiologia III

Densitas corporis contrariis signis innotescit.

Sanitas deflectens Vacillans est, quae in morbos est prona. Haec con- | stitutio [50]
neutra dici potest.

Hujus signa sunt *Actiones vacillantes seu infirmae.*

5 *Sanitas vacillans est Decidentiae vel Convalescentiae.*

Sanitas decidentiae est quae jamjam in morbos est prolapsura.

Convalescentia, est eorum, qui à morbis convalescunt et nondum integrè sunt restituti.

10 Atque ita *cognitionem physiologicam* per nostra *perspicua principia*, pro brevitate quâ hic utimur, expeditimus: quia *antiqua* dicta, quae peripateticis adscribi solent, ut multi ingenui et ingeniosi etiam ante nos viderunt, in omnibus claudicare deprehenduntur. *Materia enim eorum non est aliquid*, nedum corpus, sed tantum *ens in potentia*, imo *pura potentia*; quae quomodo substantiam corpoream vel sola vel cum aliis, quae non sunt corpora, constituat, nullâ sanâ ratione intelligi potest:
15 *forma* verò rerum, quae vulgò dicitur *substantialis*, ipsis, ut apertè fatentur, est incognita; uti et omnes *qualitates occultae*. Neque *Manifestae* appellatae ipsis melius sunt perspectae, licet harum cognitionem ubique sibi attribuant: nam ut ex nostris dictis et ipsorum descriptionibus patet, quid *calor, frigus, humiditas et siccitas* sint, ipsos latet; unde facile intelligimus etiam omnes *secundas* dictas ipsos
20 fugere, quippe quae secundum ipsos ex quatuor istis primis nuncupatis originem ducant. *Motus* autem, quem ipsi definiunt, *actum entis in potentiâ, quatenus in potentiâ*, est contradictorius; et quamvis esset verus, cum nullus praeter localem unquam dari vel definiri possit, esset tamen ista definitio ipso definito obscurior.

25 *Chymicorum* tria principia, *Sal, Sulphur, et Mercurium*, quod attinet; nec illa ad naturas rerum rectè explicandas quicquam momenti habent: praeterquam enim quod inter ipsos nondum satis convenire videatur quid sit *Mercurius*; ipsa principiorum nomen nullo modo merentur, quandoquidem ex nostris principiis, utpote prioribus, constituuntur, atque ideo, nisi ex his explicentur, nullo modo intelligi possunt; huc accedit quod ipsorum *phlegma et caput mortuum* res ipsas etiam
30 constituent, quae tamen à principiorum suorum numero excludere consueverunt.

DISPUTATIONUM MEDICARUM

SEXTA,

DE MORBORUM SIGNIS.

QUAM

Divino annuente Numine,

SUB PRAESIDIO

Clarissimi Medici et Philosophi,

D. HENRICI REGII,

Medicinae et Botanices Professoris ordinarii,

Publicè, in almâ Ultrajectinâ Academiâ

examinandam proponit,

JOHANNES DE RAEI.

Ad diem 15. Decemb. horis locoque solitis.

ULTRAIECTI,

Ex Officina AEGidii Roman, Academ. Typo-

Graph. Anno 1641.

*Clarissimo, Doctissimo, Expertissimoque
Viro,*

D. GISBERTO COETSIO,
Reipub. Arnhemensis Med. Ord.
Affini suo nunquam non colendo.

*Hoc Exercitium Medicum
Animo officioso offert*

IOHANNES DE RAEI
Resp.

SEXTA,

De Morborum Signis.

Resp. Iohanne de Raei.

SECTIO I.

1. Morbi, si latuerint, cognoscuntur *signis*. Aliquando enim adeo sunt manifesti, ut per se pateant.

Signum est, quicquid sensibus nostris obvium, vel morbum, vel aliquid ad ipsum pertinens, potest indicare.

5 Estque morbi vel *causa*, vel *effectum* seu *symtoma*.

His quidam *addunt comparationem partium inter se*: ut cum chirurgus ad explorandam luxationem, partem sanam cum illâ, de qua dubitat, confert.

10 *Juventia et laedentia* ad effecta possunt referri. Si quis igitur in aliquo morbo ex usu, ex. gr. lactucae nocumentum sentiat, morbus frigidus ex effecto hîc cognoscitur: ille enim facit, ut hoc vel illud juvet vel laedat.

Communiter grassantia mala ad causas, scilicet aërem, cibum, vel simile quid, sunt referenda. Si itaque communi morbo multi laborent, suspicandum est etiam illum, qui jam aegrotare incipit, eodem malo esse correptum, signo petito à causâ; nempe aëre, cibo, vel aliâ simili.

15 *Praestantissima* autem *signa*, sunt ipsa morborum *effecta* sive *symtomata*: inter quae illa prae caeteris excellunt, quae in *pulsibus* et *urinis* observantur.

De Pulsibus.

2. *Pulsus* est motus, quo cor et arteriae, à rarescente et protruso per vices sanguine, alternatim dilatantur et contrahuntur.

20 Ejus *partes* duae sunt: *diastole* et *systole*. | [96]

Diastole est pars pulsus, quâ cor, à sanguinis satis magnis guttis, quae è venâ cavâ et arteriâ venosâ sanguine perpetuò ex circulatione plenis in ventriculos depletos, tum ob impetum ipsa à rarefactione in corde factâ per continuas sanguinisque plenas arterias et venas impressum, tum à spontanea vasorum contractione et ipsius fluidate, in *systole* insiliunt, et plerumque etiam suâ gravitate in illos incidunt;⁴⁴ ibidemque tum ob suam dilatabilitatem, tum ob reliquias sanguinis in corde existentes, tum ob cordis calorem vehementer rarescunt: arteriae vero, à sanguine in corde rarefacto atque in illas erumpente, reliquumque arteriarum venarumque omnium sanguinem propellente et illum ac tunicas arteriarum concutiente et vibrante; 30 eodem momento dilatantur.

3. Neque *huic ingressui sanguinis in cor* quicquam repugnat experientia, qua paucissimus aliquando in cadaverum venâ cavâ sanguis fuit inventus. Ille enim in vivo aegro ita fuit dilatatus, ut venam cavam, quae pro copiâ contenti sanguinis contrahi et extendi solet, posset replere. **Etsi itaque paucus in copore nonnun-**

44 Cf. D/R 26, ll. 16–20.

quam sit sanguis, venae nihilominus ipso sunt plene; quia hae ad mensuram
ejus perpetuò secundum latitudinem et profunditatem sese **contrahunt**,⁴⁵ ut vel
solae venae, quae in exteriori manu sunt conspicuae, ad oculum frequentissimè
docent. Si igitur per haemorrhagiam tantum quarta sanguinis pars in corpore sit
5 reliqua, existimo vasa, quamvis laxiora, ipsum quam proximè complecti, ipsumque
ea replere. Quamvis autem in aegris vena cava interdum non ita sanguine esset
plena, ut circulatio sanguinis ad extremum posset continuari; possent tamen aegri
vitam, etiam sine ullâ sanguinis circulatione, aliquantillum ducere. Nam in multis
moribundis sanguis, prius in venulis minoribus et à corde remotioribus refrigeratur,
10 coagulatur seu condensatur et incrassatur, quam in venâ cavâ prope cor: atque ideo
ipse, ne novus per circulationem ex arteriis sanguis tum accedat, impedit: dum
interim sanguis ex cavâ per spontaneam vasorum contractionem in cor labitur.⁴⁶
Hac autem exhaustâ aeger exstinguitur. |

[97]

Non est autem hîc tantum intelligenda *spontanea vasorum contractio*, quae ab
15 ipsorum subsidentiâ oritur; sed etiam illa, quae eam facit. Et si quis illam nondum
admittat, rogo ut praeter innumera alia observet puerum vesicam suillam fistulâ
urethrae insertâ inflantem, et os post inflationem à fistulâ patente auferentem, et
intelliget, ut puto, spontaneam quandam contractionem, quae subsidentiam efficit,
non quae ab illâ originem ducit.⁴⁷ Talem autem esse vasorum sanguine repletorum
20 spontaneam contractionem, de qua hic loquor, docet *propulsio sanguinis, quae
illis ligatis contingit*, et nullâ aliâ intelligibili ratione explicari potest, quam *primò*
per impetum, quem sanguis antea à rarefactione in corde facta acceperat, et adhuc
in ipso aliquamdiu post impeditum omnem novum rarefactionis impetum perse-
verat, ut motus in lapide projecto per aliquod tempus continuari solet: et *deinde*
25 à spontanea venarum contractione sive *earum per fibras coarctatione*, quae san-
guinem antea motum per laevissimam earum interiorem superficiem, etiam tum
aliquamdiu propellit, cum ipse ob injectam ligaturam novum impetum à corde
accipere non potest. Quid autem opus in fibris vasorum magis vim animalem
quaerere, quam in corii, fidium testudinis vesicae exsectae, aliorumque similium
30 expansorum spontaneâ contractione; cum hujusmodi vasorum contractio etiam in
iis exsectis et mortuis appareat?

Motus verò sanguinis versus cor, in vasis liberis est perpetuus et continuus;
non autem continuò in illud incidit, aut insilit; quia cum sanguinis guttae in Corde
dilatantur, mox valvulae foris intro spectantes claudunt venam cavam et arteriam
35 venosam, sanguisque continuo versus cor fluentis ingressum impediunt, ac venas
circa cor plusculum intumescere faciunt.

4. Atque ex his, quae de spontaneâ vasorum contractione diximus, intelligi
potest, quomodo *arteria cervicalis* in tumore colli, et *cruralis* foris indurata, ali-
quando *sine sanguine in cadaveribus fuerint inventae*. Haec enim vasa à corpore
40 duro foris fuerunt compressa, ita ut novus sanguis in illa propelli à corde non

45 Cf. D/R 26, II. 7–10.

46 Cf. D/R 26, II. 11–15.

47 Cf. D/R 28, II. 29–31.

posset: sanguinem | autem in illa antea impulsum spontanea vasorum contractio [98]
ex cavitate eorum in alia vasa propulsavit.

5 5. Atque hinc etiam constat *nulla nos cogi necessitate, ut cordi* aut aliis
partibus non intelligibilem imo *impossibilem sanguinis attractionem attribuamus*;
quam quidam *per magnetis et ferri conjunctionem* perperam conantur probare: cum
10 *magnetica attractio* nondum sit probata, imo nunquam ab ipsis sit probanda, quippe
qui illam per occultam qualitatem fieri dicant, atque ita se principium petere apertè
declarent. Quod si tamen hoc praeter meam sententiam aliquando fecerint; (cum
15 nulla fiat attractio, nisi attrahens rei attrahendae fuerit alligatum) promitto me tum
quoque vincula, quibus ferrum magneti in attractione est alligatum, ostensurum.
Interim moneo ne quis inani labore hîc se fatiget.⁴⁸ *Magnetica enim operatio non*
20 *est tractoria, sed pulsoria*; quod datâ occasione evidenter demonstrabitur.

6. *Statuo autem impetuosum illum cordis, arteriarum, et sanguinis motum*
oriri à vehementi ejus in sinibus rarefactione, eamque effici à sanguinis dilata-
15 bilitate, ejusque reliquiis in cordes ardentibus, nec non à cordis calore, ac ejus
vasorumque conformatione; quibus interdum accedit, ut ex. gr. in animi pathema-
tis vehementioribus, varius spirituum animalium in dilatatorias vel contractorias
cordis fibras influxus: quandoquidem hae causae sufficiunt.

Qui autem valde *intensum cordis calorem* requirunt, ut illae sanguinis guttae
20 tam celeriter ad illud inflandum rarefiant, non videntur advertisse, quo pacto lac,
oleum, et alii fere omnes liquores igni appositi, initio quidem sensim et lente
se dilatent; ubi verò ad certum caloris gradum pervenerunt, momento temporis
intumescant, adeo ut, nisi ab igne statim removeantur, maxima eorum pars in
25 cineres effundatur: nec meminisse hunc gradum caloris, pro variâ liquoris naturâ
varium esse oportere, ita ut quidam, etiam vix dum tepidi, sic rarefiant. His enim
animadversis (ut recte docet Author Dioptricae Gallicae in epistolis ad *Fromundum*
*et Plempium*⁴⁹) facile judicarent sanguinem in cujusque animalis venis contentum
ad illum caloris gradum quam proxime pervenisse, ut in Corde quasi in momento
30 rareseat. | [99]

7. Non opus est igitur ut quisquam ad *animalem cordis contractionem et*
dilatationem, tanquam ad sacram anchoram, hîc confugiat, ut vehementem illam
et ordinariam sanguinis propulsionem explicet: praeterquam enim quod ille entia
multiplicaret absque necessitate, talem etiam *proferret causam, quae hujusmodi*
effectum non posset producere. *Animalis enim motus*, varius, et praesertim diu-
35 turnus, requirit alternarum spirituum animalium, ab animâ seu mente certo modo
determinatorum, in partem variè et diversimodè movendam è cerebro influxum,
vel saltem alternatam eorum ab anima in cerebro determinationem; ut quilibet in
paralyticis, imò se ipso quotidie potest observare. **Qui itaque motum cordis ajunt**
esse animalem, non plus dicunt, quam si faterentur se nescire causam motus
40 **cordis: quia hoc dicendo, indicant se nescire quid sit verus motus animalis.**

40 quid cf. D/R 28, l. 40] quis *Phys.*

48 Cf. D/R 28, ll. 22–25.

49 Cf. R/D 1B, ll. 27–31.

Physiologia VI

Neque his adversatur motus, qui in partibus abscissis anguium, lacertarum, aliorumque animalium observatur: **cum enim horum partes dissectae moventur, non aliam ob causam id contingit, quam cum mucro cordis etiam dissectus pulsatur; nec ille ob aliam, quam cum nervi testitudinis in particulas dissecti, atque**
5 **in loco calido et humido existentes vermium instar sese contrahunt; quamvis hic motus, artificialis, et alius animalis à quibusdam dicatur. In omnibus enim istis causa est dispositio sive conformatio partium solidarum, et motus spirituum sive partium fluidarum solidas permeantium, illasque agitantium.**⁵⁰

8. *Non esse autem ordinarium cordis motum ullo modo animale: sed tantum à rarefactione sanguinis in eo factum, clarissime probat vel solum anguillae corculum, quod jam dudum mortuum et in superficie siccum, mediocri calore foris ei admoto et sanguine addito, quasi reviviscere, et rursus satis celeriter pulsare conspicitur. Imò corculi anguillae pars suprema, cui sc. vena cava inferitur, à reliquâ abscissa, ex admoto calore nullum motum acquirit, propterea quod multi*
10 *meatus ibi sint aperti, per quos omnis vapor è sanguine exhalans non impedito motu evolet. Sed post horae quadrantem vel amplius, ubi affusa sanguinis guttula, cui particula illa corculi resecta innatat, in | superficie siccari et quadam quasi cute [100] obduci caeperit, manifesta in ea pulsatio adspicitur, quae calore admoto increbescit, et non desistit, donec omnis humor sanguinis fuerit exhaustus.*

9. Frustra autem hic obijcitur effervescentia in coralliis, sale tartari, limatura ferri, aliisque similibus ex adiectione acidorum orta, et bullas tantum attollens; nihil autem, etiam per augustias tubi vitrei, vehementius propellens: cum illa nihil nobis officiat, nisi prius probetur in corde haud majorem nec aliam ex influxu sanguinis oriri rarefactionem;⁵¹ et praeterea cor in animali non aliter, quam vitrum
25 illud, sese habere, quod certe nunquam factum, nec unquam fiet: est enim illa longè alia et vehementior in corde; ut ex ordinaria cordis et arteriarum vibratione, et certissima ac sole meridiana clariore sanguinis circulatione, aliâque ejus ex vasis expulsionem, patet, quae nulla alia ratione, ut ex antedictis constat, recte explicari possunt: cordisque structura est longè alia. Quilibet igitur aequus harum
30 rerum pensicator his causis, ut pote sufficientibus et intelligibilibus, meo iudicio, poterit acquiescere, nec entia ulterius volet multiplicari absque necessitate.

10. Hinc jam constat *usum, seu utilitatem et necessitatem* generandorum spirituum et expellendarum foliginum, *inter causas motus cordis, arteriarum, et sanguinis, non esse numerandas*: cum enim nec cor, nec arteriae, nec sanguis,
35 *nec facultas vitalis* dicta, quae in illis solis commemoratis causis consistit, sint res intelligentes; nihil etiam propter *usum* aliquid agere sunt dicenda. |

50 Cf. D/R 28, ll. 41–49.

51 Cf. D/R 26, ll. 21–23.

SECTIO II.

11. *Systole* est pars pulsus, qua cor, propter expulsam rarescentis sanguinis maximam partem, detumescit:⁵² et simul arteriae, ob aliquam sui per poros evacuationem, et sanguinis impulsu refrigerationem, subsidunt.

5 *Cum enim* sanguis ob causas à me propositas, in corde vehementer rarescit, cor dilatatur et maxima sanguinis portio, per illam rarefactionem, è corde expellitur, ut docet autopsia: reliquus itaque in corde sanguis, qui, cum alio sanguine rarefactus et dilatatus, ad illud distendendum imbecillis, utpote paucus et solus, spontaneae cordis contractioni resistere non potest: atque ita cor subsidit, et subsidendo etiam aliquantillum sanguinis in arterias propellit, donec ejus subsidentia et sanguinis
10 expulsio paulatim magis magisque imminuta à valvularum intus foras spectantium ad subsidendum, utpote gravium et flexibilium, proclivitate fuerit victa, ipsaeque valvulae satis arcto inter se collapsu subsederint. Neque haec valvularum subsidentia à reliqui ventriculorum sanguinis fervore impeditur: cùm enim ille ad summum pervenerit, ulteriorem dilatationem non desiderat, ut etiam in pulveris
15 pyrii incendio passim observatur. Cum itaque *disp. 2. pag. 22.* dico sanguinem è corde egredi in arterias, in cordis et arteriarum diastole; intelligo hoc ita fieri, ut omnis fere expellendus sanguis in dilatationis vigore vi rarefactionis erumpat: pauxillum verò, et quod respectu alteriùs fere nihili rationem habet, ac ideo non est observabile, in ipsâ spontaneâ cordis contractione expellatur. Neque haec istius
20 pau- | xilli sanguinis impulsio in arterias, quae à spontanea cordis contractione fit, impedit ipsas arterias eodem tempore una cum corde subsidere: cum enim illa sit valde pauxilla, et praeterea magis magisque imminuatur, ac tandem omnino deficiat; idcirco par et comitans arteriarum subsidentiae, à sanguinis refrigeratione et earum evacuatione ortae, incrementum permittere potest.

25 Atque ita *valvulae semilunares* collapsae non tantum impediunt relapsum sanguinis ex arteriis in cor, sed etiam retinent in corde reliquias sanguinis ibidem existentes; quod nemo ut opinor, rejiciet, qui aquam duabus cataractis inclusam, et intus, quam foris, quò tamen valvae spectant, sublimiorem aliquando observavit.

30 12. Porro cum *auricularum cordis motus* suâ etiam obscuritate non careat, isque tantum leviter antehac à me sit descriptus; haec ad ejus illustrationem addere forsân non inutile videbitur. Ubi itaque cordis valvulae foris intro spectantes, propter sanguinem in cordis ventriculis dilatatum, clausae, et versus ipsa vasa cum impetu sublatae, ulteriorem sanguinis in illos influxum impediunt, sanguis in latis venae cavae et arteriae venosae ostiis circa cordis ventriculos, non tantum sistitur,
35 sed etiam impetuosè attollitur, et propterea pars ejus in auriculas sinibus cordis adjacentes copiosius impulsa eas dilatât et expandit; quae deinde, subsidente corde,

52 Cf. D/R 26, ll. 24–29.

Physiologia VI

in ventriculos, una cum reliquo in ostiis haerente sanguine, effluit: unde ipsae auriculae postea detumescunt et subsidunt. Cordis igitur motus fit à sanguinis illapsi rarefactione et evacuatione: auricularum verò, à solo sanguinis impulsu et egressu. Fiunt autem diversis temporibus, quia cum cor depletur, hae implentur; ubi verò hae deplentur, cor repletur. Et hinc jam constat ipsas auriculas tantum esse latorum istorum ostiorum portiones corrugatas et ob viciniam cordis carnosiores;⁵³ licet aliae vicinae eam carnositatem non habeant. Atque haec ita se habent in valido animali in moribundo autem, cum calor cordis et sanguinis multum sit imminutus, et tantum pauxillum sanguinis, ob languidam, imò interdum fere nullam ejus ex impresso impetu progressionem, valvulas foris introspectantes aperire, et in collapsos seu arctatos cordis ventriculos sese insinuare possit, sanguis valde tardè, et difficulter ibidem rarescit; atque hinc pulsuum cordis aliquot fiunt intermissiones. In auriculis tamen adhuc aliquamdiu alternatus pulsationis apparet motus, propterea quod sanguis, qui in iis est reliquus, per vices guttulatim in ventriculos instillatus, motum auricularum, non propter repletionem aut rarefactionem, sed ob solam earum evacuationem efficiat.

Neque obstat sanguinis hujus identidem elabentis paucitas: cum enim in valido animali sanguis non motu continuo, sed per vices interrupto ex auriculis in cor affatim influat, fibrae partium per quas ille transit, ita longissimo isto usu conformantur, ut si vel minimum quid per eas elabatur, tantundem fere et tam citò aperiantur, quantum consueverunt, cum majori alicui sanguinis particulae transitum praebent. Simile in januis nostris apparet, quae tantundem à globulo transeunte, quam ab aequè crassâ et longâ virgâ secundum totam altitudinem transmissâ, aperiri solent.

4 implentur] ineplentur *Phys.*

53 Cf. D/R 26, II. 30–32.

BIOGRAPHICAL LEXICON

ÆMILIUS, or Melis, Antonius (Aachen 1589 – Utrecht 1660)

Æmilius' father was Burgomaster of Hasselt (now Belgium), but the family fled to Dordrecht because of their reformed belief. Æmilius studied theology in Leiden from 1607 till 1611, and in Saumur in 1612. From 1615 till 1619 he was rector of the Latin School at Dordrecht. In 1619, Æmilius was appointed rector of the Hieronymus school in Utrecht, where he took on his former college friend Isaac Beeckman as deputy headmaster a month later. Finally, in 1633, he was appointed professor of history and rhetoric at the Illustrious School (University since 1636). His contacts with Descartes date from the Spring of 1639, when he sent Descartes his funeral oration on Reneri, in which the philosopher was excessively praised (ÆM/D 5). Descartes gave him a copy of the *Meditationes* for commentary (cf. D/R 15), but there is no evidence of any contacts between the two after 1640. In 1647, after his break with Regius, it was Æmilius whom Descartes described as 'the most prominent ornament of the university [of Utrecht]' (cf. AT VIII B 203), but there is no indication that they ever met or continued their correspondence after 1640.

Lit. BURMAN 1738, 3–6; MONCHAMP 1886, 190–191; NNBW, I, 38–39; *Resolutiën*, 34; VAN BERKEL 1983, 50, 54, 99, 102, 138; VERBEEK 1992A, 57, 96, 124.

BEVERWIJCK, Johan van (Dordrecht 1594 – Dordrecht 1647)

Johan van Beverwijck studied medicine at Leiden University, and then made a grand tour through France and Italy. After his graduation in Padua in May 1616, he returned to Holland and set up a medical practice in his hometown, Dordrecht. He held several public positions, such as town physician (since 1625) and town librarian (since 1636). With the foundation of an Illustrious School in 1643, he was appointed professor of medicine. Van Beverwijck is famous for his publications on much debated issues, in which he collected letters on the subject by eminent scholars. Asked to make a contribution on the theory of the circulation of the blood, Descartes sent him his correspondence with Plempius (VAN BEVERWIJCK 1644). According to Baillet, Descartes visited Van Beverwijck in June 1644, but there is no independent evidence of that.

Lit. NNBW, I, 327–332; LINDEBOOM 1984, 128–130; POELHEKKE 1961, 315.

GOLIUS, or Gool, Jacob (The Hague 1596 – Leiden 1667)

Golius matriculated at Leiden University in 1612 to study mathematics. His interest in ancient mathematical texts brought him to the study of Arabic. In the 1620s he made several journeys to North-Africa and the Middle-East, collecting a vast amount of Arabic manuscripts. In 1625 he was appointed professor of Arabic at Leiden University, and in 1633 professor of mathematics as well. Being a close friend of Descartes, he accepted the role of judge in the Stampioen-affair in 1640.

Lit. NNBW, X, 287–289; W. Juynboll, *Zeventiende-eeuwsche Beoefenaars van het arabisch in Nederland*, Ph.D. Diss. Utrecht 1931, 119–183.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

HAESTRECHT, Godefroot van (Drunen 1592/93 – Utrecht 1659)

Van Haestrecht was the second son of Dirk van Haestrecht, Lord of Drunen and Gansoyen, and Anna van Malsen. Baillet, relying on Pierre Borel (*Vitae Renati Cartesii*, 1656, 49), mistakenly believes that Van Haestrecht originated from the Liège-area in Belgium. He was an officer in the Dutch army and a renowned strategist. In 1623, he matriculated at Leiden university to read mathematics. From the early 1620's onwards he was a canon in the Chapter of the Utrecht Dom-church. After the death of his elder brother Charles Otto (†1641), he acted as guardian of his niece Isabella Maria but, having renounced his rights in 1632, he never accepted the title. He died in Utrecht in January 1659, and was buried in his native village. Van Haestrecht is listed among the Utrecht friends of Descartes by his early biographers. According to Baillet he lived in the castle 'Renoude', at half a mile from Utrecht. This probably refers to the castle of Rhijnauwen, three kilometers from Utrecht, although his stay in the castle is not recorded. Van Haestrecht's death certificate has 'Achter de St. Pieter' (Utrecht) as his address, and a poem by Barlaeus describes his study as *basilicae ultrajectinae annexum*, which description corresponds to that address. He was one of the first to understand the importance of Descartes' *Géométrie*, and a short commentary by him was added to the Latin edition of that work (Amsterdam 1649). Perhaps he is also the author of 'Le calcul de Mr Descartes', an introduction to the *Géométrie*. Van Haestrecht is the likely addressee of two letters of Descartes, one from October 1637 (AT I 459–460) and one from 1645 (AT IV 227–231).

Lit. NNBW, I, 1017; *Album Stud. Lugd.-Bat.*, 166; AT II 577; 580; AM III, 323–327; THIJSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 83–84; COSTABEL 1988, 62–63; W. van Oosterhout *et al.*, *Archief van de heerlijkheid Drunen*, Oisterwijk 1996, 26, 33; Caspar Barlaeus, *Poemata*, 1655, vol. I, 371–375; vol. II, 62–64, 295, 415, 487.

HEYDANUS, or Van der Heyden, Abraham (Frankenthal 1597 – Leiden 1678)

After his theological studies in Leiden, which he started in 1617, Heydanus became a minister, first, at Naarden in 1623, and four years later in Leiden. In 1648 he was appointed professor of theology at Leiden University. In philosophy he preferred Cartesianism to Aristotelism.

Lit. CRAMER 1889; NNBW, VII, 587–588; BLGNP, II, 240–243.

HOGELANDE, or Hoog(h)elande, Cornelis van (Leiden 1590 – Wassenaar 1676)

Except for his being a Roman Catholic and an intimate friend of Descartes, we know virtually nothing of Van Hogelande. He practiced as a physician in Leiden. In 1646, he published a tract on mechanical physiology that reflected Descartes' doctrines very closely (VAN HOGELANDE 1646). Van Hogelande acted as an intermediate of Descartes' correspondence, forwarding and redirecting his letters. Upon moving to Sweden, Descartes left him with a trunk of manuscripts, which included the letters by Huygens, and presumably Regius' letters to Descartes as well.

Lit. NNBW, II, 594–595; THIJSEN-SCHOUTE 1954, 228–230, 232–234; LINDEBOOM 1984, 890–891; FRENCH 1989, 68–72, 81–85.

Biographical Lexicon

HOOLCK, Gijsbert van der (Utrecht 1597/98 – Utrecht (?) 1680)

Van der Hoolck was one of the founders of Utrecht University (1636), and one of the two Burgomasters of Utrecht in 1634–1639 and again in 1641–1642. In 1642, he became deputy of the States of Utrecht to the States General in The Hague. His friendship with Descartes probably dates back from Descartes' stay at Utrecht in 1635. As the most important *curator* of the university, Van der Hoolck acted as an influential protector of Regius during the crisis in 1641–1642. In 1643, Descartes seems to have been disappointed in him, when he suspected him of taking measures, contrary to Descartes' wish, to ensure an early end of the lawsuit against the French philosopher in Utrecht (cf. AT IV 30).

Lit. VAN DER AA, III, 367.

PICOT, Claude ((?) c.1601 – Paris (?) 1668)

Except for his connections with Descartes, whose *Principia* he translated into French (Paris 1647), little is known about Picot. According to Baillet, the intimate friendship between Descartes and *l'Abbé Picot, Prieur de Rouvre*, dates back to 1628 (*Vie*, I, 168). He visited the Netherlands from May 1641 till autumn 1642, staying at Leiden and Utrecht, but mostly with Descartes at the castle Endegeest (cf. AT III 388, 390, 594; AT V 653; R/D 44F). Conversely, Picot hosted Descartes in Paris in 1644 and 1647. Preparing his trip to Sweden, Descartes entrusted him with his financial dealings in France (cf. *Vie*, II, 348/AT V 227).

Lit. Baillet, *Vie*, passim; AM IV 402–404.

PLEMP(IUS), Vopiscus Fortunatus (Amsterdam 1601 – Leuven 1671)

Born in Amsterdam of a Catholic family, Plemp was educated at a Jesuit college in Gent. He was a student at Leuven, Leiden, Padua and Bologna, where he graduated in 1624. He practised in Amsterdam from 1624 to 1633. In 1634 he was appointed professor of medicine at Leuven University. Descartes and Plemp knew each other personally, and it seems likely that they dissected animals together in Amsterdam in the early 1630s. Plemp's initial rejection of the theory of the circulation of the blood disappointed Descartes, and his apparently unauthorised publication of a shortened version of Descartes' letters to Plemp on the subject in *De fundamentis medicinae* (1638) put an end to their relationship. In the second edition of his work (1644) Plemp accepted the circulation of the blood, be it along Harveyan lines.

Lit. NNBW, VI, 1136–1137; *Album Stud. Lugd.-Bat.*, 152, 198; MONCHAMP 1886, 35–37; LINDEBOOM 1984, 1544–1546; POELHEKKE 1961, 319.

POLLOT, or Palloti, Jean-Alphonse (Dodier (Piemont) c.1603 – Geneva 1668)

Pollot joined the Dutch States' army at the age of 17. Despite the loss of his right arm during the siege of 's-Hertogenbosch in 1629, he stayed in the service of the Dutch army. In 1633 he was appointed a captain. He was also known as 'Monsieur Alphonse' to distinguish him from his brother Jean-Baptiste Pollot (†1641), whom he succeeded as chamberlain of Frederik-Hendrik in 1642. After the Stadholder's death, Amalia van Solms appointed him her personal steward in 1648. He returned to Geneva in 1659. He

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

was a close friend of Descartes', who profited from his connections in The Hague when the Utrecht Vroedschap intended to put him on trial in 1643.

Lit. NNBW, II, 1117–1119; Adam, *Vie de Descartes*, AT XII (1910), 567–575.

RAEY, Johannes de (Wageningen 1622 – Amsterdam 1702)

De Raey, who became the most important Cartesian philosopher in the Netherlands in the second half of the 17th century, was Regius' most gifted student, both in philosophy and in medicine. His matriculation at Utrecht University is not recorded, but he acted as a respondent of several of Regius' disputations in 1641 and 1643. In October 1643, he matriculated at the University of Leiden. After his graduation in July 1647, he settled down to a practice in Leiden, obtaining permission to give private lectures on Aristotle's *Problemata* at the university. In 1653 he was appointed associate professor of philosophy, and five years later associate professor in medicine as well. His full professorship followed in 1661. In 1668 he accepted the invitation to the chair of philosophy at the Amsterdam Athenaeum.

Lit. *Album Stud. Lugd.-Bat.*, 344, 366; LINDEBOOM 1984, 1584–1585.

REGNERI AB OOSTERGA, Cyprianus (Zwolle (?) 1614 – Utrecht 1687)

Van Oosterga studied in Groningen and Leiden, where he graduated in Law in 1634. After his studies he remained in Leiden where he gave private lectures and polemized with the Leiden professors Claude Saumaise and Johannes Maestertius. In March 1641, he was appointed professor of law at Utrecht University. During the Utrecht Crisis, Van Oosterga refused to sign the ban on Cartesianism, probably because he believed the procedures to be illegitimate. His independent mind is furthermore shown by his polemic with Voetius on ecclesiastical property.

Lit. BURMAN 1738, 253–260; NNBW, II, 1179–1180; *Album Stud. Lugd.-Bat.*, 243; *Resolutiën*, 145–146; DUKER 1989, II, 305–306.

RENERI(US), Henricus (Huy 1593–Utrecht 1639)

After his conversion to the Reformed faith, Reneri gave up his studies at Leuven University and went to Leiden in 1616. In 1631, he was appointed professor of philosophy at the Illustrious School at Deventer and finally in Utrecht (1634). His intimate friendship with Descartes dates back from 1629, when they both lived in Amsterdam.

Lit. BURMAN 1738, 301–304; NNBW, II, 1191–1193; MONCHAMP 1886, 33–35, 38–40, 122–124; SASSEN 1941; DIBON 1954, 197–202/DIBON 1990, 206–218; DE HAAN 1993; VERBEEK 1993c.

SCHOOCK(IUS), Martin (Utrecht 1614 – Frankfurt a/d Oder 1669)

Martin Schoock studied philosophy and theology in Franeker, Leiden and Utrecht. The intended foundation of an Illustrious School (1634) in his hometown made him return to Utrecht. Schoock acted successfully as the respondent during the first disputation at the Illustrious School, presided by Reneri (Van Buchell 1940, 23). In 1636, he received the first doctoral degree (*magister artium*) granted by Utrecht University. In 1638, he accepted an invitation to the chair of history and eloquence of the Illustrious School at Deventer. Three years later he was appointed professor of logic and physics in Groningen. Debts and personal problems made him flee to Germany in 1666, where

Biographical Lexicon

he took up a chair in history in Frankfurt a/d Oder, and became historiographer of the Elect of Brandenburg. During his Utrecht years, Schoock engaged in a polemic on behalf of Voetius against Remonstrants, Socinians and Roman Catholics. In later years he crossed swords with Claude Saumaise and Descartes among others, including his preceptor Voetius, with whom he broke in 1645. Schoock's wide interests emerge from his numerous publications ranging from philosophy to a history of beer and a treatise on herring.

Lit. REVIUS 1651, 710–712; Effigies, 131–133; BURMAN 1738, 324–342; NNBW, X, col. 889–891; BLGNP, II, 394–395; DUKER 1989, II, III, passim; DIBON 1954, 180–188.

SCHURMAN, Anna Maria van (Cologne 1607 – Wieuwerd 1678)

Van Schurman was famous for her erudition, excelling in Oriental languages and poetry. In 1638 she published a discourse on the appropriateness of scholarship for women (*Dissertatio ... de capacitate ingenii muliebris ad scientias*). Under the mentorship of Voetius, her interests shifted to theology, and she became interested in the French Pietist mystic Jean de Labadie, whose community she finally joined in 1669. Van Schurman personally knew Descartes (VAN DER HORST 1984, 282, 283), but she severed relations after Descartes' alleged remark, when he found her studying a Hebrew Bible, that such was a waste of time since nothing clear or distinct was to be found there (cf. AT III 231; AT IV 700–701). Her brother Johan Godschalk (1605–1664), who introduced De Labadie to the Netherlands, translated parts of Descartes' *Discours* for the benefit of Schoock's anti-Cartesian work (Schoock 1643), in addition relaying to him the things he heard Descartes say on the Holy Scriptures (SCHOOCK 1646, 28; BOS 1999A, 70).

Lit. BURMAN 1738, 348–355; NNBW, I, 1465–1466. Further references are found in the bibliographical notice by Eileen O'Neill in GARBER/AYERS 1998, II, 1461–1462. On J.G. Schurman, see LINDEBOOM 1984, 1787.

STAMPPIOEN, Johan Jansz. de Jonge (Rotterdam 1610 – (?) 1653)

The mathematician Stampioen, called the Younger as he was named after his father, apparently was a gifted teacher, because he became a tutor to Prince William II, Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia, and Huygens' eldest sons Constantijn and Christiaan. In 1633, he challenged Descartes to solve a mathematical problem, which problem Descartes easily solved. In return, Descartes asked him to solve the classical problem of Pappus, which Stampioen was unable to do (AT I 275–280, 573–578). In 1638, Stampioen published a broadsheet, at his own printing house *In sphaera mundi* at The Hague, in which he challenged Dutch mathematicians to solve two mathematical problems. The challenge was taken up by Descartes' friend in Utrecht, Jacobus van Waessenaer, who solved both questions using Descartes' geometrical method. The dispute on their respective solutions (the so called Stampioen-affair) was settled by a jury in 1640 in favour of Van Waessenaer.

Lit. NNBW, VII, 1308–1309; CM IX 199–200.

SYLVIUS, Franciscus dele Boe (Hanau 1614 – Leiden 1672)

Sylvius studied in Jena, Wittenberg, and finally graduated in medicine at Basle in 1637. He matriculated at Leiden in November 1638, and he received the permission to lecture

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

on anatomy. His public demonstrations on dogs of the circulation of the blood attracted many spectators, among whom Descartes and Walaeus. However, as an appointment at the university failed to materialize, he settled down to practice in Amsterdam in the autumn of 1641. Finally, in 1658, he was ordained professor of medicine in Leiden. Just like Regius and Descartes, he believed that the blood is expelled from the heart during the diastole, but in their explanation of the phenomena they differed greatly. Being a iatrochemist, he was convinced that all physiological and pathological processes could be conceived in analogy to processes and experiments observed in the chemical laboratory. He explained these processes in terms of effervescence, fermentation and putrefaction.

Lit. NNBW, VIII, 1290–1294; *Album Stud. Lugd.-Bat.*, 299; BAUMANN 1949; LINDEBOOM 1984, 1939–1943; DSD, XIII, 222–223.

SURCK (or Zurck or Zurich), Anthony Studler van (Amsterdam (?) c.1608 – (?) 1666) Van Surck was a correspondent and a close friend of Descartes; his acquaintance with the Frenchman dates from 1633, when they both lived in Amsterdam (AT I 268–269). In October 1633, he went to Leiden to study law, and he matriculated again at Leiden University in 1636 and 1639. He was Lord of Sweyburg and Bergen (from 1640), Knight of Holland, and ‘Hoogheemraad van de Uitwaterende Sluizen’. He acted as Descartes’ banker in Holland.

Lit. *Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 258, 280, 305; P. Leendertsz. Jr, *Uit den Muiderkring*, Haarlem 1935, 37, 51–54; *De Navorscher*, 94 (1953), 43–44.

VOET, Paulus (Heusden 1619 – Utrecht 1667)

Paulus Voet, the eldest son of Voetius, studied in Utrecht, and became *magister artium* on 29 June 1640 (Voet 1640). In April 1641 he was appointed associate professor in metaphysics (full professor in 1644), giving additional lectures in Greek. In 1654, he graduated in law, and was ordained professor of law in the same year, leaving his chair in philosophy to his brother Daniel Voet (1629–1660). During the 1640s he defended his father against Descartes and Samuel Maresius in a number of pamphlets, the most interesting being the anonymously issued *Aengevangen procedueren* (Voet 1644), in which he published many documents pertaining to the process against Descartes in Utrecht in 1643. His major works include *Theologia naturalis reformata* (1656), *Prima philosophia reformata* (Utrecht: J. van Waesberge, 1657), and *De statutis eorumque concursu liber singularis*, (Amsterdam: J. van Waesberge, 1661). The latter work had two new editions in the 18th century.

Lit. BURMAN 1738, 427–430; NNBW, III, 1329–1330; *Resolutiën*, 154, 208–209; *Acta*, 202; DIBON 1954, 216–217.

VOETIUS, Gisbertus (Heusden 1589 – Utrecht 1676)

Voetius studied theology at Leiden University from 1604 till 1611. After his studies, he became a minister at Vlijmen (1611), Heusden (1617–1634) and 's-Hertogenbosch (1629–1630). He was appointed professor of theology and Hebrew at the Utrecht Illustrious School at a salary of 1200 guilders in June 1634. Three years later he became a minister in Utrecht as well. On 13/23 August 1636 he graduated in

Biographical Lexicon

theology at the University of Groningen. Philosophically he was an Aristotelian, in theology he was an orthodox Calvinist. He was a prolific writer and a zealous polemist against Roman Catholics, Remonstrants and Socinians. He considered Descartes to be a 'subtle' atheist, that is, someone who claims to give irrefutable proof of God's existence, but in reality destroys the foundations of Faith. Voetius' main works are *Exercitia et bibliotheca studiosi theologiae* (VOETIUS 1644), *Disputationes theologicae selectae* (VOETIUS 1648–1669), *Exercitia pietatis* (Gorinchem 1664) and *Politica ecclesiastica* (3 vols., Amsterdam 1663–1676).

Lit. BURMAN 1738, 396–426; NNBW, VII, 1279–1282; BLGNP, II, 443–449; *Resolutiën*, 55, 56–57; *Album Stud. Acad. Gron.*, 446; DUKER 1989; OORT 1989; VAN RULER 1995. An inventory of his correspondence is published in BOS 1998.

WALAEUS, or De Waal, Johannes (Koudekerke 1604 – Leiden 1649)

Walaeus studied philosophy and medicine in Leiden, where he graduated in medicine in 1631. Two years later he was appointed associate professor, but he became full professor at Leiden university only in 1648. At first a sharp critic of Harvey's theory, he was convinced after the public demonstrations on the circulation of the blood by Sylvius. Enthusiastically he started to perform his own experiments, which he published in the form of two letters to Thomas Bartholin.

Lit. NNBW, IX, 1270–1272; SCHOUTEN 1972; SCHOUTEN 1974; LINDEBOOM 1984, 2117–2119.

WAESSENAER, Jacobus van (Utrecht 1607 – Utrecht 1682)

Jacob van Waessenaer, a surveyor in Utrecht, is mainly known from his joint combat with Descartes against the Dutch mathematician Stampioen. He was one of a circle of men in Utrecht who devoted themselves to the study of Descartes' *Géométrie*. If his father, Jacob van Waessenaer Sr, indeed was a former professor of mathematics in Utrecht, as Baillet claims, he would have been a teacher at the Latin School, and not at the university or the Illustrious School.

Lit. NNBW, VII, 1308–1309; AT I 29; VERBEEK 1995, 100–101.

WASSENAER, Petrus (†Utrecht 1680)

In 1647 Petrus Wassenauer added a set of corollaries to a disputation which he intended to defend under Regius. The rector, however, censored the corollaries, which were taken from Regius' published and unpublished works. Wassenauer and Regius then published the corollaries separately as a broadsheet, entitled *Explicatio mentis humanae*. In reply to Descartes' *Notae in programma quoddam*, Wassenauer wrote an open letter to Descartes, published in Regius 1648, in which he defended his professor against the French philosopher. In 1669 he became town physician. In one of Regius' wills he inherits Regius' manuscripts, but there is no evidence that he actually received them.

Lit. *Acta*, 229; *Resolutiën*, 233; DE VRIJER 1917, 44, 74, 171–173, 176; DE WAARD 1947; VERBEEK 1992A, 54, 59, 122, 125; VERBEEK 1995, 18–19, 37.

WATERLAET, Lambertus vanden (Gemert c.1619 – Alem 1678)

Vanden Waterlaet's parents destined him to become a monk at the monastery of St. Agatha at Cuyck, but he left the convent and was converted to the Reformed Faith.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

His first matriculation at Utrecht University is not recorded, but he acted as Voetius' *respondens* during the disputations in December 1641 against the New philosophy. In 1642, he published a reply to Regius' *Responsio* (VANDEN WATERLAET 1642). After his theological studies in Utrecht and Leiden, where he matriculated on 22 February 1642, he became a minister at Pannerden (1645), Ravenstein (1649), and finally at Alem (1652).

Lit. *Album Stud. Lugd.-Bat.*, 329; BOTS/MATTHEY/MEYER 1979, 756; VAN LIEBURG 1996, 274.

CONCISE CHRONICLE OF REGIUS' LIFE

All dates are in Old Style (OS) unless otherwise stated.

- 1598/07/29 Birth of Hendrik de Roy (Henricus Regius) in Utrecht. His parents are Justus (Joost) de Roy and Deliana (Tilia) Petri Adriana van Wyckersloot. (GRAEVIUS 1679, 7–8; BURMAN 1738, 290; DE VRIJER 1917, 5; THUISSEN-SCHOOTE 1954, 9). The Utrecht family De Roy was a wealthy family of beer brewers.
- 1604/04 Regius' parents, as well as his brother Hugo (on May 13), fall victim to the plague. Regius is raised by his uncle Mr. Hadrianus (Adriaen) de Roy, member of the Utrecht Vroedschap and member of the Admiralty of Zeeland at Middelburg (GRAEVIUS 1679, 8; DE VRIJER 1917, 5; THUISSEN-SCHOOTE 1954, 9).
- 1616/04/03 Regius matriculates at Franeker University: 'Hendricus de Roi, Ultrajectinus, studiosus juris' (*Album Stud. Acad. Fran.*, 58). At the University of Franeker he becomes *magister artium* (GRAEVIUS 1679, 10–11; DE VRIJER 1917, 6).
- 1617/10/22 Regius decides to pursue his studies in medicine at the University of Groningen: 'Henricus de Roy, Ultrajectinus, Med.' (*Album Stud Acad. Gron.*, 6). He studies under Nicolaus Mulerius (1564–1630), and acts as a *respondens* during one of his medical disputes on 18 April 1618 (MULERIUS 1618; GRAEVIUS 1679, 11–12; DE VRIJER 1917, 6).
- 1618/09/24 (NS) Regius matriculates at Leiden University as a medical student: 'Henricus de Roy Ultrajectinus. 20, M.' (*Album Stud. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*, 137). He takes lessons from the well known professors of medicine Otto Heurnius (1577–1652) and Everhardus Vorstius (1565–1624) (GRAEVIUS 1679, 12; Graevius confuses Johannes Heurnius (1543–1601) with his son Otto).
- [1621]–1623 Regius makes his 'grand tour' through France and Italy. After visiting Paris, he travels to Montpellier, where he stays for one year to study with Lazarus Riverius (1589–1655). On his way to Italy he is robbed, and he becomes a soldier in the French army to make some money. As soon as he receives money from home, he crosses the Alps to Italy (GRAEVIUS 1679, 12–14; DE VRIJER 1917, 6–7).
- 1621/05/05 According to an inscription in the *Album amicorum* of Cornelis Valck, Regius is at Frontignan (DIBON 1990, 136).
- 1622/08/13 Regius is at Valence, according to Graevius to hear the famous jurist Julius Pacius (1550–1635) (inscription in the *Album amicorum* of E. Averkamp, cf. DIBON 1990, 136; GRAEVIUS 1679, 13–14; DE VRIJER 1917, 7).
- 1622/09/19 Regius matriculates at the Faculty of Medicine of Padua University, and becomes a member of the Dutch/German student society: 'Henricus de Roy ultrajectinus inclit Germanorum Nationis albo libens nomen suum inscripsit soluto consueto pretio ...' (ROTHSCHUH 1968, 62; POELHEKKE 1961, 318).
- 1623/03/29 Regius graduates in Padua. Among his *promotores* are the famous physicians Cesare Cremonini (1550–1631), Santorio Santorii (1561–1636) and Adrianus Spigelius (Van den Spiegel) (1578–1625). The number of *promotores* suggests

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- that the candidate was considered to be excellent (DE VRIJER 1917, 7; ROTHSCUH 1968, 62–63; POELHEKKE 1961, 318 gives March 30).
- 1625/09/19 Regius is appointed town physician in Utrecht. The position is unpaid, but the town physicians are allowed to give anatomical demonstrations (DE VRIJER 1917, 8).
- c.1630 Regius is appointed Rector of the Latin School at Naarden (DE VRIJER 1917, 12).
- 1631/06/04 The minister at Naarden, Hermannus Antonides van der Linden (†1646), informs the Classis of Amsterdam that Regius refuses to sign the Reformed Act of Faith (DE VRIJER 1917, Bijlage II; VAN LIEBURG 1996, I, 151).
- 1631/08/02 During a session of the Amsterdam Classis a delegation reports their conclusion, after visiting Regius, that he is poisoned with Arminian and Socinian heresies. In an acrimonious letter to the Classis Regius accuses the Naarden minister Van der Linden of libel. The Classis summons Regius, but he refuses to appear (DE VRIJER 1917, Bijlage II).
- 1631/10/06 After a second appeal, Regius meets the Classis and states that he subscribes unconditionally to the doctrine of the Dutch Reformed Church. A week later he signs the Reformed Act of Faith, and apologises for his angry letter. Finally, on December 15, the Classis reports that Regius, after a reprimand, has been accepted again to the bosom of the church (DE VRIJER 1917, Bijlage II; cf. DIBON 1950, 282–283/DIBON 1990, 633–634).
- 1634/01/21 Regius marries Maria de Swart at Utrecht. They have three sons and two daughters, but only their daughter Maria (†1657) survived infancy (GRAEVIUS 1679, 15; DE VRIJER 1917, 16).
- 1634/03/19 Upon moving to Utrecht, Regius receives an attestation of Orthodoxy from the Church Council of Naarden (DE VRIJER 1917, 17).
- 1634/04/01 Regius is confirmed as a church member of the Dutch Reformed Church in Utrecht (DE VRIJER 1917, 17). He moves into the house in the ‘Oudmunstertrans’ bought by his wife in 1629 (GAU, ‘Transporten en plechten’).
- 1637/09/25 Regius is appointed town physician in Utrecht (DE VRIJER 1917, 9).
- 1638/07/11 Regius is appointed professor *extra ordinem* of theoretical medicine and botany at Utrecht University, on a salary of 400 guilders (*Resolutiën*, 127).
- 1638/08/18 [NS] Regius’ first letter to Descartes (R/D 1).
- 1638/09/06 Inauguration of Regius at Utrecht University (*Resolutiën*, 128).
- 1639/03/18 Regius becomes full professor (*Resolutiën*, 132).
- 1640/04/17 Regius’ salary is raised to 600 guilders, with effect from 5 April 1640, and he receives to the permission to lecture once a week on physical problems (*Resolutiën*, 139–140; cf. NH, 12–13/*Querelle*, 85–86).
- 1640/06/10 Regius’ first disputation at Utrecht University, on the circulation of the blood (REGIUS 1640A).
- 1641/04/17 The start of a series of disputations on physiology (REGIUS 1641A).
- 1641/12/08 During the third disputation of a second series of disputations (REGIUS 1641B) Regius’ thesis of man as an *ens per accidens* offers his opponent, the

Regius Chronicle

- theologian Gisbertus Voetius, the opportunity to attack the New Philosophy in his disputations in the second half of December.
- 1642/02/16 Publication of *Responsio* (REGIUS 1642), Regius' and Descartes' reply to Voetius' attack. Two days later, on the request of the academic senate, the Burgomasters seize all copies that had not yet been sold (*Resolutiën*, 158; cf. NH, 53/*Querelle*, 117).
- 1642/03/15 The Vroedschap passes a resolution which forces Regius to give up any public courses or private lectures other than medical, and they authorise the academic senate to publish their judgement on the *Responsio* (*Resolutiën*, 159).
- 1642/03/17 The academic senate officially condemns Cartesian philosophy (*Acta*, 160).
- 1642/09/17 Regius' salary is raised by 200 guilders (*Resolutiën*, 164).
- 1643/06/05 The Vroedschap institutes a committee of inquiry, which will investigate Descartes' accusations against Voetius in his *Epistola ad Voetium* (*Resolutiën*, 182–183).
- 1643/09/13 Descartes' *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* and *Epistola ad Voetium* are condemned as defamatory writings by the Utrecht Vroedschap (*Resolutiën*, 185).
- 1645/07/23 [NS] Regius's last letter to Descartes (R/D 58).
- 1646/08 Publication of *Fundamenta physices*, dedicated to the Stadholder Frederik Hendrik. Descartes, who was strongly opposed to the publication, dissociates himself from Regius in the preface to his *Principes* (1647).
- 1647/05/31 The Vroedschap honours Regius with 150 guilders for his dedication of *Fundamenta medica* (WIJNNE 1888, 64; *Resolutiën*, 232).
- 1648/01 Publication of Descartes' *Notae in programma quoddam*, in reaction to Regius' *Explicatio mentis humanae* (1647).
- 1649/03/01 Regius' salary is increased by 200 guilders (*Resolutiën*, 241; WIJNNE 1888, 67).
- 1649/03/15 Regius is proclaimed Rector magnificus (*Resolutiën*, 243).
- 1654/05/29 Regius donates the Municipal Library two copies of his *Philosophia naturalis* (*Resolutiën*, 299). One of these copies is kept in the Utrecht University Library (AB Q qu 24).
- 1661/01/17 Regius dedicates the third edition of his *Philosophia naturalis* to King Charles II, who elevates him into knighthood (DE VRIJER 1917, 17, 180).
- 1661/12/02 Regius is appointed *primarius medicinae professor* (WIJNNE 1888, 88; *Resolutiën*, 364; DE VRIJER 1917, 220).
- 1662/03/18 Regius becomes Rector magnificus for the second time (*Acta*, 365).
- 1670/01/25 Death of Maria de Swart (DE VRIJER 1917, 16).
- 1673/11/06 The French army exacts a levy under threat, from the city of Utrecht, and takes several hostages, including Regius, to secure payment (DE VRIJER 1917, 74–76).
- 1674/02/04 Regius returns safely to Utrecht (DE VRIJER 1917, 74).
- 1679/02/19 Regius dies and is buried on 25 February in the Church of St. Catherine (DE VRIJER 1917, 87–88).

— |

| —

— |

| —

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations between brackets refer to the libraries in which rare books and prints may be found. The following libraries are included:

BA	<i>Bibliotheca Albertina</i> , Universitätsbibliothek, Leipzig
BGU	Bibliotheek Gemeente-archief, Utrecht
BL	British Library, London
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris
Bodl	Bodleian Library, Oxford
BSM	Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München
Debr	Library of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District and the Reformed College, Debrecen
Erl	Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg
Herb	Bibliothek des Ev. Theol. Seminars, Herborn
KB	Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague
NSG	Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen
NLH	Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, Hannover
NLM	National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland
Pet	Saltykov-Schedrin State Public Library, St Petersburg
SLD	Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden
SPK	Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin
UBA	Universiteitsbibliotheek Amsterdam
UBL	Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden
UBL _e	Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig
UBR	Universitätsbibliothek Regensburg
UBT	Universiteitsbibliotheek Tilburg
UBU	Universiteitsbibliotheek Utrecht
Wolf	Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel

Primary Sources

Unpublished Sources

Debrecen, Library of the Reformed Transtibiscan Church District and the Reformed College:

- R 685, *Album amicorum* of János Szárosi.
- R 687, *Album amicorum* of János Dállyai Vas.

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France:

- MS 4469 (*Exemplaire de l'Institut*), *Lettres de Mr Descartes*, vol. I, Paris: Ch. Angot, 1667 (third edition);
- MS 4471 (*Exemplaire de l'Institut*), *Lettres de Mr Descartes*, vol. III, Paris: Ch. Angot, 1667.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- Utrecht, Utrecht Archives (Gemeente-archief (GAU) and Rijksarchief (RAU)):
- ‘Acta Academiae Ultraiectinae, 1641–1684’, Toegang 292-1, inv. no. 1. Manuscript NH, ff. 43r–60v.
 - Archives of the Dom-chapter, Toegang 216, ‘Acquiten’, inv. no. 704-16-a (1638), registrar of ‘overluidingen’, f. [5v].
 - Doop-, trouw- en begraafboeken.
 - ‘Rekeningen van de tweede kameraar’, Toegang 702-2, inv. no. 1259., Oct. 1638–Sept. 1640. The expenses of the printer of the Academy (Æg. Roman) are listed as “Wtgaven van papier, pennen en ijnkt”.

Published Sources

- Æmilius, Antonius. 1639. *Oratio in obitum (...) Henrici Renerii (...) Habita in templo maximo postridie exequiarum XV Kal. April. 1639. Accedit ejusdem Carmen Funebre*, Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [BGU; BL; Herb; UBA].
- 1651. *Orationes ac nonnulla eiusdem poemata*, Utrecht: E. van Zijll and T. van Ackersdijck.
- Apáczai, János Csere. 1653. *Magyar encyclopaedia*, Utrecht: J. van Waesberge. [BL]. (repr. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1959; Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Könyvtár és Múzeum, 1975).
- Apáti, Nicolaus (Miklós). 1688. *Vita triumphans civilis, sive universa vitae humanae peripheria, ad mentem illustris herois et philosophi, D. Renati Des Cartes, ex unico centro deducta*, Amsterdam: A. van Someren. [Debr].
- Bacon, Francis. 1963. *The Works of Francis Bacon*, J. Spedding, R. Ellis and D. Heath (eds.), 14 vols., Stuttgart, Bad Cannstatt: F. Frommann Verlag/G. Holzboog (reprint of London: Longmans, 1857–1874).
- Baillet, Adrien. 1691. *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*, 2 vols., Paris: D. Horthemels (repr. Geneva: Slatkine, 1970).
- 1692. *La vie de Mr. Des-Cartes (...) Reduite et abregé*, Paris: Musier (reprint: Vanves: La table ronde, 1946).
- Bartholin, Thomas. 1740. *Epistolarum medicinalium a Doctis vel ad Doctos scriptarum centuria I-IV*, 4 vols., The Hague: P. Gosse.
- Batelier, Jean. 1642. *Verantwoordinge tegen Gisberti Voetii Remonstrantsche catechismus, dat is: een klare ontdeckinge en wederlegginge van sijne loose en lasterlijcke aenwijsingen inde catechisatie over den Remonstrantschen catechismus*, Amsterdam: P. Walschaert.
- Beverwijck, Johan van. 1644. *Epistolicae quaestiones, cum doctorum responsis accedit ejusdem, nec non Erasmi, Cardani, Melanchthonis, Medicinae encomium*, 2 vols., Rotterdam: A. Leers.
- Blok, P.J. 1901. ‘Drie brieven van Samuel Sorbière over den toestand van Holland in 1660’, *Bijdragen en mededeelingen van het Historisch Genootschap*, 22 (1901), 1–89.

Bibliography

- Borrichius, Olaus. 1983. *Itinerarium 1660–1665. The Journal of the Danish Polyhistor Ole Borch*, H.D. Schepelern (ed.), 4 vols., Copenhagen/London: C.A. Reitzels Forlag/E.J. Brill.
- Bots, H. and P. Leroy. 1978–1980. *Correspondance intégrale d'André Rivet et de Claude Sarrau, 1641–1650*, 3 vols., Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press.
- Bruyn, Johannes de. 1644. *Disputatio philosophica inauguralis de aestu maris, iure et iustitia, ac crepusculis*, Utrecht: P.D. Sloot. [BL].
- Buchell, Arnold van. 1940. *Notae Quotidianae van Aernout van Buchell*, J.W.C. van Campen (ed.), Utrecht: Kemink.
- Burman, Caspar. 1738. *Trajectum eruditum, virorum doctrina inlustrium, qui in urbe Trajecto, et regione Trajectensi nati sunt, sive ibi habitaverunt, vitas, fata et scripta exhibens*, Utrecht: J. van Paddenburg.
- Descartes, René. 1643a. *Epistola Renati Des-Cartes, Ad celeberrimum Virum D. Gisbertum Voetium. In qua examinantur duo libri, nuper pro Voetio Ultrajecti simul editi: unus de Confraternitate Mariana, alter de Philosophia Cartesiana*, Amsterdam: L. Elzevier.
- 1643b. *Brief van Rene Des Cartes, Aen den vermaerden D. Gisbertus Voetius. Inden welcken overwoghen worden twee Boecken, onlangs voor den selven Voetius tot Utrecht uyt-gegeven, den eenen geintituleert Confraternitas Mariana, ende het ander, Philosophia Cartesiana*, Amsterdam: R. Dirckz. van Baardt.
- 1657–1667. *Lettres de Mr Descartes*, 3 vols., Claude Clerselier (ed.), Paris: Ch. Angot. (A new edition of the first volume appeared in 1663, and a reprint of the second edition in 1667. The second volume (1659) was reprinted in 1666. The third volume was published in 1667).
- 1664. *L'Homme de René Descartes et un Traitté de la formation du foetus du mesme authieur. Avec les Remarques de Louis de la Forge Docteur en Medecine, demeurant à la Fleche, Sur le Traitté de l'Homme de René Descartes; et sur les Figures par luy inventées*, Paris: Ch. Angot.
- 1673. *Les Méditations Metaphysiques (...) nouvellement divisées par articles, avec des somaires à costé, et avec des renvois aux Responses, pour en faciliter la lecture et l'intelligence, par R[ené] F[édé]*, Paris: Th. Girard/M. Bobin/N. le Gras.
- 1930. *Discours de la méthode*, texte et commentaire par É. Gilson, Paris: J. Vrin.
- 1936–1963. *Correspondance*, Ch. Adam and G. Milhaud (eds.), 8 vols., Paris: P.U.F. (repr. Nedeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970–1979).
- 1959. *Lettres à Regius et Remarques sur l'explication de l'esprit humain*, Texte latin, traduction, introduction et notes par G. Rodis-Lewis, Paris: J. Vrin.
- 1964–1971 (1996²). *Œuvres de Descartes*, 11 vols., Ch. Adam and P. Tannery (eds.), Paris: J. Vrin (reprint with corr. and add., P. Costabel and B. Rochot (eds.), of the original edition 1896–1910).
- 1966. *Opere scientifiche di Descartes*, vol. I, *La Biologia*, G. Micheli (ed.), Turin: UTET, 1988².
- 1985–1991. *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, 3 vols., transl. J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, D. Murdoch and A. Kenny, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- 1996. *Verantwoordingh van Renatus Descartes aen d'achtbare overigheid van Utrecht*, getranscribeerd, geannoteerd en ingeleid door E.-J. Bos, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- 2000. *Écrits physiologiques et médicaux*, Présentation, textes, traduction, notes et annexes de V. Aucante, Paris: P.U.F.
- Descartes, R. and H. Regius. 1997. *Il carteggio. Le polemiche*, R. Bordoli (ed.), Napels: Cronopio.
- Descartes, R. and M. Schoock. 1988. *La Querelle d'Utrecht*, Textes établis, traduits et annotés par Th. Verbeek, Préface de J.-L. Marion, Paris: Les impressions nouvelles.
- Gassendi, Pierre. 1644. *Disquisitio metaphysica, seu dubitationes et instantiae adversus Renati Cartesii Metaphysicam et Responsa*, Amsterdam: J. Blaeu (repr. B. Rochot (ed.), Paris: J. Vrin, 1962).
- 1658. *Opera omnia*, 6 vols., Lyon: L. Anisson and J.-B. Devenet (repr. Bad Canstatt: F. Frommann Verlag, 1964).
- Graevius, Johannes Georgius. 1679. *Oratio funebris in obitum viri clarissimi et celeberrimi Henrici Regii*, Utrecht: M. à Dreunen.
- Grotius, Hugo. 1928–2001. *Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius*, P. Molhuysen, B. Meulenbroek, P. Witkam, H. Nellen and C. Ridderikhof (eds.), 17 vols., The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Heereboord, Adriaan. 1648. *Sermo extemporaneus de recta philosophicè disputandi ratione*, Leiden: F. Hackius.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1994. *The Correspondence*, N. Malcolm (ed.), 2 vols., Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Hogelande, Cornelis van. 1646. *Cogitationes quibus Dei existentia, item animae spiritalitas, et possibilis cum corpore unio demonstrantur. Nec non brevis historia oeconomiae corporis animalis proponitur, atque mechanicae explicatur*, Amsterdam: L. Elsevier.
- Huygens, Christiaan. 1888–1950. *Œuvres complètes de Christiaan Huygens*, publ. par la Société Hollandaise des Sciences, 22 vols., The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Huygens, Constantijn. 1911–1917. *Briefwisseling*, J.A. Worp (ed.), 6 vols., The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- 1996. *A Selection of the Poems of Sir Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687)*, P. Davidson and A. van der Weel (eds.), Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Kort ende oprecht verhael van het oprichten ende invoeren der nieuweren broederschap van onse Lieve-Vrouwe (soo genaemt) binnen 's Hertogenbosch*, s.n. s.l., 1645. [KB; UBL; UBT].
- [Leemans, Cornelis]. 1642. *Retorsio calumniarum, quas Tertullus Sodalitatis Marianaе advocatus, C. L. Eccl. Sylvaeduc. administro, suppresso nomine impegit, in nupera sua defensione pietatis et synceritatis (ut vocat) optimatum N.N. in negotio fraternitatis B. Mariae Virginis*, Amsterdam: J. Broers. [KB; UBL; UBT].
- Licetus, Fortunius. 1653. *De lucernis antiquorum reconditis*, Utini: N. Schiratti (first edition: Venice, 1621).

Bibliography

- Lipstorp, Daniel. 1653. *Specimina philosophiae Cartesianae quibus accedit ejusdem authoris Copernicus redivivus*, Leiden: J. and D. Elsevier.
- Livre synodal contenant les articles résolus dans les Synodes des Eglises Wallonnes des Pays-Bas*, 2 vols., The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1896–1904.
- Maresius, Samuel. 1642. *Defensio pietatis et synceritatis Optimatum Sylvae-ducensium in negotio Sodalitatis quae à B. Virgine nomen habet, testibus veritate et charitate*, 's-Hertogenbosch: J. van Doccum.
- 1645. *Ultima patientia tandem expugnata à D. G. Voetio*, Groningen: J. Nicolai. [Herb; UBL; Wolf].
- 1646. *Bonae fidei sacrum; sive documenta omni exceptione majora veracitatis et innocentiae Samuelis Maresii theologi, in causa Schoockio-Voetianâ*, Groningen: J. Nicolai.
- Matthaeus, Anthonius. 1644. *Commentarius de criminibus*, Utrecht: J. van Waesberge (translation: *On crimes: a commentary on books XLVII and XLVIII of the Digest*, M.L. Hewett and B.C. Stoop (eds.), 4 vols., Cape Town/Pretoria: Juta & Co/University of Cape Town Press/University of South Africa, 1987–1996.
- Mercurius Cosmopolita. 1640. *Pentalogos in libri cujusdam Gallico idiomate evulgati quatuor discursuum, De la Methode; Dioptrique; Météorique; et Geometrique*, The Hague: F. Spruit.
- Mersenne, Marin. 1945–1991. *Correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne religieux minime*, C. de Waard, R. Pintard, B. Rochot and A. Beaulieu (eds.), 18 vols., Paris: P.U.F./Éditions du CNRS.
- Mulerius, Nicolaus. 1618. *Disputatio anatomica De thorace*, [Resp.] Henricus de Roy, Ultrajectinus, Groningen: Joan. Sassii. [BL].
- Plempius, Vopiscus Fortunatus. 1638. *De fundamentis medicinae libri VI*, Leuven: J. Zegers.
- 1644. *Fundamenta medicinae*, sec. corr. and enl. edition, Leuven: wid. J. Zegers.
- Primrose, Jacob. 1630. *Exercitationes et animadversiones in librum de motu cordis et circulatione sanguinis adversus G. Harvei*, London: Bourne.
- 1640a. *Animadversiones in disputationem Medicam, quam pro Circulatione sanguinis Harveana Walaeus proposuit*, Amsterdam: J. Janssonius.
- 1640b. *Animadversiones adversus Theses, quas pro circulatione sanguinis in Academia Ultrajectina Regius disputandas proposuerat*, Leiden: J. Maire.
- 1644. *Antidotum adversus Henrici Regii Ultraiectensis Medicinae Professoris Venenatam Spongiam sive Vindictae Animadversionum*, Leiden: J. Maire.
- Raey, Johannes de. 1692. *Cogitata de interpretatione quibus natura humani sermonis et illius rectus usus, tum in communi vita et disciplinis ad vitae usum spectantibus, tum in philosophia, ad hujus seculi errore et confusione vindicantur. Accedunt Notae recentes ad partem primam generalem; cum Appendice ex olim scriptis, propter cognationem*, Amsterdam: H. Wetstein.
- Ravensberger, Jacobus. 1640. *Disputatio astronomica de mundi systemate*, Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [Herborn].
- 1641. *Disputatio mathematico-philosophica*, Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [BL].

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- Regius, Henricus. 1640a. *Disputatio medico-physiologica pro sanguinis circulatione (...) sub praeside D. Henrici De Roy (...) Exercitii gratia, Publice defendere conabitur Iohannes Haymannus (...) ad diem 10. Iunii*, Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [NLM]. (repr. AT III 727–734).
- 1640b. *Spongia qua eluuntur sordes Animadversionum quas Jacobus Primirosius Doctor Medicus adversus Theses pro Circulatione sanguinis in Academia Ultrajectina disputatas nuper edidit*, Leiden: W. Christiaens for J. Maire.
- 1641a. *Physiologia, sive Cognitio sanitatis. Tribus disputationibus in Academia Ultrajectina publice proposita*, Utrecht: Æg. Roman.
- 1641b. *Disputatio medica prima [– tertia] De illustribus aliquot quaestionibus physiologicis*, Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [SPK].
- 1642. *Responsio, sive Notae in Appendicem ad Corollaria Theologico-Philosophica Viri Reverendi et Celeberrimi D. Gisberti Voetii, SS. Theologiae Doctoris et Professoris, et in Academiâ Ultrajectina p.t. Rectoris Magnifici, verbique Divini in Ecclesia Ministri*, Utrecht: J. van Doorn. [BnF; NSG; UBL; UBU].
- 1646. *Fundamenta physices*, Amsterdam: L. Elzevier.
- 1647. *Fundamenta medica*, Utrecht: Th. van Ackersdijck.
- 1648. *Brevis explicatio mentis humanae*, Utrecht: Th. van Ackersdijck. [BL; UBL].
- 1650a. *De affectibus animi dissertatio*, Utrecht: Th. van Ackersdijck (repr. with German translation: HOHN 1990).
- 1650b. *Hortus Academicus Ultrajectinus*, Utrecht: Th. van Ackersdijck and G. van Zijll. [BGU; BL].
- 1654. *Philosophia naturalis*, sec. corr. and enl. ed. of REGIUS 1646, Amsterdam: L. Elzevier.
- 1657a. *Brevis explicatio mentis humanae, sive animae rationalis; antea publico examini proposita, et deinde operâ Henrici Regii Ultrajectini nonnihil dilucidata, et à notis Cartesii vindicata*, Editio postrema, prioribus auctior et emendatior, ad calumniarum quarundam rejectionem, nunc evulgata, Utrecht: Th. van Ackersdijck and G. van Zijll.
- 1657b. *Praxis medica. Medicationum exemplis demonstrata. Editio secunda, Priore multo locupletior, et emendatior*, Utrecht: Th. van Ackersdijck and G. van Zijll.
- 1661a. *Epistola Henrici Regii ad V. Cl. Clerselierum Jctum Parisiensem*, Utrecht: Th. van Ackersdijck and G. van Zijll.
- 1661b. *Philosophia naturalis*, third ed. of Regius 1646, Amsterdam: L. and D. Elzevier.
- Reinhardt, C. 1911. *Briefe an Ehrenfried Walther von Tschirnhaus von Pieter von Gent*, Freiberg.
- Roth, L. 1926. *Correspondence of Descartes and Constantijn Huygens, 1635–1647: Ed. from Manuscripts now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Formerly in the Possession of the Late Harry Wilmot Buxton*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Roy, Hugo de. 1639. *Disputatio juridica inauguralis de quarta legitima*, Leiden. [Bodl].

Bibliography

- 1645a. *Auriacus triumphans sive Panegyricus (...) Frederico Henrico post Hulstum, et fortissima Flandriae propugnacula expugnata*, Utrecht: P.D. Sloom. [UBA].
- 1645b. *De eo quod justum est, et circa id philosophiae, theologiae et juris-prudentiae syncretismo libri tres*, Utrecht: G. van Zyll. [UBA; UBL; UBU].
- Schoock, Martinus. 1643. *Admiranda methodus novae philosophiae Renati des Cartes*, Utrecht: J. van Waesberge.
- 1646. *Necessaria et modesta defensio pro veritate ac innocentia sua, in causa inter eum ac Rever. Doctorem Voetium controversia*, Groningen: J. Nicolai.
- Sorbière, Samuel. 1660a. *Lettres et discours de M. Sorbière, sur diverses matières curieuses*, Paris: F. Clousier.
- 1660b. *Relations, lettres et discours, sur diverses matières curieuses*, Paris: R. de Ninville. [BnF; BSM; UBA].
- 1691. *Sorberiana*, Toulouse: Colomiez and Posuël.
- Stampioen, Johan Jansz. de Jongere. 1639. *Algebra ofte Nieuwe stel-regel, Waer door alles ghevonden wordt inde Wis-Konst, wat vindtbaer is*, The Hague: In sphaera mundi.
- 1640. *Verclaringe over het gevoelen by de E: H: Professoren matheseos der Universiteit tot Leyden uyt-gesproken*, The Hague: In sphaera mundi.
- Swammerdam, Jan. 1667. *Tractatus physico-anatomico-medicus de respiratione usuque pulmonum*, Leiden: D.A. and A. Gaasbeek.
- 1975. *The letters of Jan Swammerdam to Melchisedec Thévenot*, G.A. Lindeboom (ed.), Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Testimonium Academiae Ultrajectinae, et Narratio Historica qua defensae, qua exterminatae novae Philosophiae*, Utrecht: W. Strick, 1643.
- Theophilus Cosmopolita. 1640. *In libellum de absoluto reprobationis decreto, versionis ex Anglico, ubi articulus de electione divina, qua Deus alios ad salutem aeternam alios ad interitum praedestinavit, impugnatur, et impia Arminianismi deliramenta extolluntur, Notae*, The Hague: F. Spruit. [NLH; SLD].
- [1643]. *In primam philosophiam Cartesianam Notae*, [The Hague: A. Meurs]. [BnF].
- Verney, Lady F.P., and Lady M.M. Verney. 1970. *Memoirs of the Verney Family during the Civil War*, 4 vols. (reprint of London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1892–1899).
- [Voet, Paulus]. [1644]. *Aengevangen Procedueren tot Wtrecht tegens Renatus Des Cartes ter oorsaecke van twee sijne Diffamatoire gheschriften of fameuse libellen. Vergadert door een liefhebber der Waerheydt*, Utrecht: W. Strick, s.n. s.a.
- Voet, Paulus. 1640. *Disputatio philosophica inauguralis De tempore et virtute heroica*, Pro gradu magisterii in philosophia artibusque liberalibus, Ad diem 29 Junii, Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [Herb].
- 1642. *Disputatio metaphysica tertia De causis, sub praesidio D. Pauli Voet LAM et Metaphysices in alma Academia Ultrajectina professoris. Publice tueri conabitur Marcus du Tour. Ad diem 19 [/29] Mart.*, Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [UBL; UBU].
- 1646. *Pietas in parentem, contra Ultimam Impotentiam Samuelis Maresii*, Utrecht: W. Strick. [UBL; Wolf].

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- 1656. *Oorspronck, voortganck en daeden der doorluchtiger Heeren van Brederode*, Utrecht: J. van Waesberge.
- Voetius, Gisbertus. 1634. *De praejudiciis verae religionis*, resp. David van Boxtel, 3 Sept. 1634 (repr. VOETIUS 1635, 335–354; VOETIUS 1648–1669, II, 539–551).
- 1635. *Thersites heautontimorumenos, hoc est, Remonstrantium hyperaspistes, catechesi, et liturgiae Germanicae, Gallicae, et Belgicae denuo insultans, retusus*, Utrecht: A. van Herwyck and H. Ribbius.
- 1639. *Disputationum theologicarum (...) de atheismo, [pars prima]–pars quarta (...) Sub praesidio D. Gisberti Voetii (...) Tueri conabor Gualterus de Bruyn* [22 and 29 June, 6 and 13 July OS], Utrecht: Æg. Roman. [Pet].
- 1641. *Catechisatie over den catechismus der Remonstranten, tot naerder openinghe ende oeffeninghe voor hare catechumenen, als oock alle andere liefhebbers der waerheydt*, Utrecht: E.W. Snellaert.
- 1642a. *De idolatria indirecta et participata, pars tertia*, resp. Rudolphus van Noordijck, 4 June 1642 (repr. VOETIUS 1648–1669, III, 278–316).
- 1642b. *Speciminem assertionum partim ambiguarum aut lubricarum, partim periculosarum, ex tractatu nuperrime scripto pro sodalitatibus B. Mariae inter reformatos erigendis aut interpolandis*, Utrecht: J. van Waesberge. (The work actually appeared in 1643).
- 1644. *Exercitia et Bibliotheca Studiosi Theologiae*, Utrecht: W. Strick.
- 1648–1669. *Disputationes theologicae selectae*, 5 vols., Utrecht: J. van Waesberge (vols. 1–3), Amsterdam: J. Janssonius van Waesberge and wid. E. Weyerstraet (vol. 4), Utrecht: A. Smytegelt (vol. 5).
- Waessenaer, Jacobus van. 1639. *Aenmerckingen op den Nieuwen stel-regel van Johan Stampioen*, Leiden: J. Maire.
- 1640. *Den On-wissen Wis-konstenaar I. I. Stampioenius Ontdeekt door sijne ongegronde Weddinge ende mis-lucte Solutien van sijne eygene Questien*, Leiden: W. Christiaens for J. Maire.
- Walaeus, Johannes. 1640. *Disputatio medica De circulatione naturali. Seu, cordis et sanguinis motu circulari. Pro Cl. Harveio (...) sub auspiciis (...) Iohannis Walaei (...) Publico examini submittit Rogerius Drake, Anglo-Brit. Londin. Ad diem 4 Febr.*, Leiden: W. Christiaens.
- 1641. *Epistola Iohannis Walaei, De motu sanguinis ad Thomam Bartholinum, Casp. Filium. Altera epistola Iohannis Walaei, De motu sanguinis ad eundem*, in: C. Bartholin, *Institutiones anatomicae*, Thomas Bartholin (ed.), Leiden: F. Hackius.
- 1645. *Iohannis Walaei Epistolae duae: De motu chyli et sanguinis, ad Thomam Bartholinum, Casp. Filium*, in: C. Bartholin, *Institutiones anatomicae*, Thomas Bartholin (ed.), Leiden: F. Hackius.
- Waterlaet, Lambertus vanden. 1642. *Prodromus sive Examen tutelare orthodoxae philosophiae principiorum, contra fictitium quoddam hujus temporis eorum pentagonum*, 2 vols., Leiden: W. Christiaens. [BnF; Bodl; Erl; Wolf].

Bibliography

Secondary Sources

Bibliographies and Reference Works

- Aa, A.J. van der. 1969. *Biografisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 7 vols., Amsterdam: B.M. Israel (reprint of Haarlem: J.J. van Brederode, 1852–1878, 21 vols.).
- Album Promotorum Academiae Franekerensis (1591–1811)*. [1972]. Franeker: T. Wever.
- Album Promotorum Academiae Rheno-Trajectinae 1636–1815*. 1936. Utrecht: J. van Broekhoven.
- Album Studiosorum Academiae Franekerensis (1585–1811, 1816–1844)*. 1968. Franeker: T. Wever.
- Album Studiosorum Academiae Groningana*. 1915. Groningen: J.B. Wolters.
- Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno-Batavae, MDLXXV–MDCCLXXXV*. 1875. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Album Studiosorum Academiae Rheno-Traiectinae*. 1886. Utrecht: J.L. Beyers and J. van Broekhoven.
- Balteau, J., Barroux, M., and M. Prévost (eds.). 1932–... *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, 18 vols., Paris: Letouzey.
- Boeles, W.B.S. 1878–1889. *Frieslands Hoogeschool en het Rijks Athenaeum te Franeker*, 3 vols., Leeuwarden: H. Kuipers.
- Bom, H.G. 1900. *Catalogus van eene merkwaardige verzameling boeken, teekeningen (...) enz. betreffende de geschiedenis (...) enz. van de stad en provincie Utrecht, alsmede van de Bibliotheca Academica Ultrajectina, indertijd bijeengebracht door den Heer G.D. Bom Gz., en vergezeld door eene collectie portretten van de professoren, gelegheidsprenten (...) enz., second title: Bibliotheca Academica Ultrajectina, of Verzameling van werken, geschreven door, of tegen, of over de Hoogleraren aan de Utrechtsche Akademie*, Amsterdam: H.G. Bom.
- Bots, H., Matthey, I. and M. Meyer. 1979. *Noordbrabantse studenten 1550–1750*, Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van het Zuiden van Nederland, vol. 44, Tilburg: Stichting Zuidelijk Historisch Contact.
- Chappell, V.C. and W. Doney. 1987. *Twenty-five years of Descartes scholarship, 1960–1984. A bibliography*, New York: Garland.
- Cramer, J.A. 1932. *De Theologische Faculteit te Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius*, Utrecht: Kemink.
- Dibon, P. 1957. *Le fonds néerlandais de la bibliothèque académique de Herborn*, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- 1971. *L'inventaire de la correspondance d'André Rivet (1595–1650)*, The Hague: Kluwer.
- Drakenborch, A. 1885–1901. 'Overluidingen te Utrecht, 1614–1651', *De Navorscher*, 35–51 (1885–1901).
- Effigies et vitae professorum Academiae Groninganae et Omlandiae*, Groningen: J. Nicolai, 1654 (repr. Groningen: Wolters Noordhoff, 1968).
- Fekete, Cs. and B. Szabó. 1979. *A Tiszántúli Református Egyházkerület Nagykönyvtá-*

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- rának (Debrecen) kéziratkatalógusa: 1850 előtti kéziratok, Magyarországi egyházi könyvtárak kéziratkatalógusai / Catalogi manuseriptorum, quae in bibliothecis ecclesiasticis Hungariae asservantur, 1, Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár.
- Gillespie, C.C. (ed.). 1970–1980. *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, 16 vols., New York: Scribner's Sons.
- Gruys, J.A. and C. de Wolf. 1980. *Thesaurus Typographi et bibliopolae neerlandici usque ad annum MDCC/Nederlandse boekdrukkers en boekverkopers tot 1700*, Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf.
- Haberling, W., Hüberling, F., and H. Vierordt (eds.). 1929–1935. *Biographisches Lexikon der hervorragenden Ärzte aller Zeiten und Völker*, 6 vols., Berlin/Vienna: Urban und Schwarzenberg.
- Horst, K. van der. 1984. *Handschriften en oude drukken van de Utrechtse Universiteitsbibliotheek*, Utrecht: HES.
- Kernkamp, G.W. 1936–1940. *Acta et decreta Senatus; Vroedschapsresolutiën en andere bescheiden betreffende de Utrechtse Academie*, 3 vols., Utrecht: Broekhoff/Kemink.
- Keynes, G. 1989. *A bibliography of the writings of Dr William Harvey 1578–1657*, Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies. Third edition rev. by G. Whitteridge and Ch. English.
- Kossmann, E.F. 1937. *De boekhandel te 's-Gravenhage tot het eind van de 18de eeuw*, The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Lieburg, F.A. van. 1996. *Repertorium van Nederlandse hervormde predikanten tot 1816*, 2 vols. Annex to: F.A. van Lieburg, *Profeten en hun vaderland. De geografische herkomst van de gereformeerde predikanten in Nederland van 1572 tot 1816*, Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1996 (Ph.D. Diss. V.U. Amsterdam).
- Lindeboom, G.A. 1984. *Dutch medical Biography. A biographical Dictionary of Dutch Physicians and Surgeons 1475–1975*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Manuila, A., Manuila, L., Nicole, M. and H. Lambert. 1970–1975. *Dictionnaire français de médecine et de biologie*, 4 vols., Paris: Masson.
- Molhuysen, P.C. 1913–1924. *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidse Universiteit*, 7 vols., The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Molhuysen, P.C., Blok, P.J. and F.K.H. Kossmann (eds.). 1974. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols., Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff's Uitgevers-Maatschappij (reprint of Amsterdam: Israel, 1911–1937).
- Nauta, D. (et al.). 1978–... *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlandse protestantisme*, 4 vols., Kampen: Uitgeverij Kok.
- Otegem, M. van. 2002. *A Bibliography of the Works of Descartes (1637–1704)*, 2 vols., Ph.D. Diss. Utrecht University, 2002.
- Poelhekke, J.J. 1961. 'Nederlandse leden van de Inclyta Natio Germanica Artistarum te Padua: 1553–1700', *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Historisch Instituut te Rome*, 31 (1961), 265–373.
- Postma, F. 1980. 'Meinardus Schotanus. Bibliografie', *Gens Schotana*, II (1980), 72–84.

Bibliography

- Postma, F. and A. Krikke. 1980. 'Bernardus Schotanus. Bibliografie', *Gens Schotana*, II (1980), 92–115.
- Pyle, A. (ed.). 2000. *Dictionary of Seventeenth-Century British Philosophers*, 2 vols., Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2000.
- Revius, Jacobus. 1651. *Daventriae illustratae sive historiae urbis Daventriensis libri VI*, Leiden: P. Leffen.
- Sassen, F. 1970. *Studenten van de Illustre School te 's-Hertogenbosch. Ter reconstructie van het Album Studiosorum*, Amsterdam/London: Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Sebba, G. 1964. *Bibliografia Cartesiana. A critical Guide to the Descartes Literature (1800–1960)*, The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Segesváry, L. 1935. *Magyar Református ifjak az utrechti egyetemen 1636–1836* (Hungarian Reformed Students at the University of Utrecht 1636–1836), Debrecen: [s.n.]. (Dutch translation (typoscript) in UBU, AB Y.2.32.2).
- Sluis, J. van, and F. Postma. 1990. *Herman Alexander Röell und seine ungarischen Studenten*, Peregrinatio Hungarorum 5, Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem.
- Someren, J.F. van. 1915–1922. *Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht: Pamfletten*, 2 vols., Utrecht: A. Oosthoek.
- Stelling-Michaud, S. and S. Stelling-Michaud. 1959–1980. *Le livre du recteur de l'Académie de Genève (1559–1878)*, 6 vols., Geneva: Librairie Droz.
- Strubbe, Eg.I. and L. Voet. 1960. *De chronologie van de Middeleeuwen en de moderne tijden in de Nederlanden*, Antwerpen/Amsterdam: Standaard-Boekhandel.
- Water, J. vande. 1729. *Groot placaatboek vervattende alle de placaten, ordonnantien en edicten, der edele mogende heeren Staten 's Lands van Utrecht, mitsgaders van de ed. groot achtb. heeren borgemeesteren en Vroedschap der stad Utrecht, tot het jaar 1728 ingesloten*, 3 vols., Utrecht: J. van Poolsum.
- Wijnne, J.A. 1888. *Resolutiën, genomen bij de Vroedschap van Utrecht, betreffende de Illustre School en de Akademie in hare stad, van de jaren 1632–1693*, Utrecht: Kemink en Zoon.

Studies

- Ahsmann, M. 1990. *Collegia en colleges. Juridisch onderwijs aan de Leidse Universiteit 1575–1630 in het bijzonder het disputeren*, Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff/Egbert Forsten.
- Andriessse, C.D. 1993. *Titan kan niet slapen. Een biografie van Christiaan Huygens*, Amsterdam/Antwerpen: Contact.
- Ariew, R. 1995. 'Pierre Bourdin and the Seventh Objections', in ARIEW/GRENE 1995, 208–225.
- 1999. *Descartes and the last Scholastics*, Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- Ariew, R. and M. Grene (eds.). 1995. *Descartes and his Contemporaries. Meditations, Objections, and Replies*, Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Armogathe, J.-R. 1994. 'L'approbation des Meditations par la Faculté de Théologie de Paris (1641)', *Bulletin cartésien* 21, *Archives de philosophie*, 57 (1994), 1–3.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- 1999. ‘La correspondance de Descartes comme laboratoire intellectuel’, in ARMOGATHE/BELGIOIOSO/VINTI 1999, 5–22.
- Armogathe, J.-R., Belgioioso, G. and C. Vinti (eds.). 1999. *La biografia intellettuale di René Descartes attraverso la corrispondance*, Atti del Convegno Descartes e l’“Europe savante”, Perugia 7–10 ottobre 1996, Naples: Vivarium.
- Asselt, W. van, and E. Dekker (eds.). 1995. *De scholastieke Voetius. Een luisteroefening aan de hand van Voetius’ Disputationes Selectae*, Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.
- Aucante, V. 1999. ‘Les médecins et la médecine’, in ARMOGATHE/BELGIOIOSO/VINTI 1999, 607–625.
- Balz, A.G.A. 1930. ‘Clerselier (1614–1684) and Rohault (1620–1675)’, *The Philosophical Review*, 39 (1930), 445–458 (repr. *Cartesian Studies*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1951, 28–41).
- Bán, I. 1958. *Apáczai Csere János*, Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Baumann, E.D. 1949. *François dele Boe Sylvius*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- 1951. *Een lijfarts der Oranjes in de 17de eeuw*, Utrecht: Kemink.
- Belgioioso, G., et al. (eds.). 1990. *Descartes: il Metodo e i Saggi. Atti del convegno per il 350 anniversario della pubblicazione del ‘Discours de la méthode’ e degli ‘Essais’*, Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.
- Belonje, J. 1953. ‘R. Descartes’, *De Navorscher*, 94 (1953), 43–44.
- Berg, G.C. van den, Spruit, J.E. and M. van de Vrugt (eds.). 1986. *Rechtsgeleerd Utrecht. Levensschetsen van elf hoogleraren uit 350 jaar Faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid in Utrecht*, Arnhem: Walburg Pers.
- Berkel, K. van. 1983. *Isaac Beeckman (1588–1637) en de mechanisering van het wereldbeeld* (Ph.D. Diss. Universiteit Utrecht).
- Berthier, A.-G. 1914–1920/21. ‘Le Mécanisme Cartésien et la physiologie au XII^e siècle’, *Isis*, 2 (1914), 37–89; 3 (1920–21), 21–58.
- Bierens de Haan, D. 1887. *Bouwstoffen voor de Geschiedenis der Wis- en Natuurkundige Wetenschappen in de Nederlanden*, 30, ‘Jan Jansz. Stampioen de Jonge en Jacob a Waesenaer’, *Verslagen en mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afdeling Natuurkunde, 3e Reeks, vol. 3 (1887), 69–119, Amsterdam: J. Müller.
- Bierens de Haan, J., et al. (eds.). 1936. *Het Utrechtsch studentenleven 1636–1936*, Utrecht: A. Oosthoeks Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Bitbol-Hespéries, A. 1990. *Le principe de vie chez Descartes*, Paris: J. Vrin.
- 1993. ‘Descartes et Regius: leur pensée médicale’, in VERBEEK 1993A, 47–68.
- Blom, H.W., Krop, H.A. and M.R. Wielema (eds.). 1993. *Deventer Denkers. De geschiedenis van het wijsgerig onderwijs te Deventer*, Hilversum: Verloren.
- Bos, E.-J. and F.G.M. Broeyer. 1998. ‘Epistolarium Voetianum I’, *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis/Dutch Review of Church History*, 78 (1998), 184–215.
- Bos, E.-J. 1999a. ‘Epistolarium Voetianum II’, *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis/Dutch Review of Church History*, 79 (1999), 39–73.
- 1999b. ‘Descartes’s *Lettre apologétique aux Magistrats d’Utrecht*. New Facts and Materials’, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 37 (1999), 415–433.

Bibliography

- 1999c. ‘La première publication de la *Recherche de la vérité* en 1684: *Onderzoek der waarheit door 't naturelijk licht*’, *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 1999-I, 13–26.
- 2001. Review of DESCARTES/REGIUS 1997, *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie*, 63 (2001), 171–172.
- Bosmans, H. 1927. ‘A propos de la correspondance de Descartes avec Constantin Huygens récemment publiée par M. Léon Roth. L’auteur principal de l’*Onwissen wiskonstenaer I.I. Stampioenius ontdeekt door Jacobus a Waessenaer* (Leyde, 1640)’, *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, 11 (1927), 113–141.
- Bots, H., Gemert, G. van, and P. Rietbergen (eds.). 1975. *L’album amicorum de Cornelis de Glarges, 1599–1683*, Amsterdam: Holland University Press.
- Bouillier, F. 1854. *Histoire de la philosophie cartésienne*, 2 vols., Paris/Lyon: Durand/Brun et C^e.
- Brienen, T., et al. (eds.) 1986. *De Nadere Reformatie: beschrijving van haar voor-naamste vertegenwoordigers*, The Hague: Boekencentrum.
- Brockbank, W. 1959. ‘The crookedness clinic of Nicholas and Peter Schot’, *Journal of bone and joint surgery*, 41 (1959), 413–417 (British number).
- Brunsting, H. 1973. *Johannes Smetius als Romeins-provinciaal archeoloog*, Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (reprint: *Museumstukken*, 1 (1989)).
- Cohen, G. 1920. *Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle*, Paris: É. Champion.
- Cole, J.R. 1992. *The Olympian Dreams and Youthful Rebellion of René Descartes*, Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Costabel, P. 1988. ‘La réception de la *Géométrie* et les disciples d’Utrecht’, in MÉCHOULAN 1988, 59–63.
- Cousin, V. 1865–1866⁵. *Fragments philosophiques pour servir à l’histoire de la philosophie*, 5 vols., Paris: Durand.
- Cramer, J.A. 1889. *Abraham Heidanus en zijn Cartesianisme*, Utrecht: J. van Druuten (Ph.D. Diss. Universiteit Utrecht).
- Crapulli, G. 1976. ‘La rédaction et les projets d’édition des *Meditationes de prima philosophia* de Descartes (Notes pour une nouvelle édition critique)’, *Les études philosophiques*, 31 (1976), 425–441.
- 1985. ‘La seconda edizione delle *Meditationes de prima philosophia* di Descartes (1642) nei suoi rapporti con la prima edizione (1641)’, in G. Crapulli (ed.), *Trasmisione dei testi a stampa nel periodo moderno*, Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 77–112.
- De Dijn, H. 1983. ‘Adriaan Heereboord en het Nederlands Cartesianisme’, *Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte*, 75 (1983), 56–69.
- Dechange, K. 1966. *Die frühe Naturphilosophie des Henricus Regius (Utrecht 1641)* (Ph.D. Diss. Münster).
- Des Chene, D. 2000. *Life’s Form. Late Aristotelian Conceptions of the Soul*, Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- 2001. *Spirits and Clocks. Machine and Organism in Descartes*, Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- Deth, R. van, and W. Vandereycken. 1988. *Van vastenwonder tot magerzucht. Anorexia nervosa in historisch perspectief*, 2 vols., Meppel/Amsterdam: Boom.
- Dibon, P. 1950. 'Notes bibliographiques sur les cartésiens hollandais', in E.J. Dijksterhuis et al., *Descartes et le cartésianisme hollandais. Etudes et documents*, Paris/Amsterdam: Presses Universitaires de France/Éditions Françaises d'Amsterdam, 261–300.
- 1954. *L'enseignement philosophique dans les universités néerlandaises à l'époque pré-cartésienne (1575–1650)* (Ph.D. Diss. Universiteit Leiden).
- 1985. 'Sur deux lettres de Descartes à Regius', *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 2 (1985), 167–189 (repr. DIBON 1990, 551–577).
- 1990. *Regards sur la Hollande du Siècle d'Or*, Napels: Vivarium.
- Dijck, G.C.M. van. 1973. *De Bossche Optimaten. Geschiedenis van de Illustre Lieve Vrouwebroederschap te 's-Hertogenbosch, 1378–1973*, Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van het Zuiden van Nederland, vol. 27, Tilburg: Stichting Zuidelijk Historisch Contact.
- Dotd van Flensburg, J.J. 1843. *Archief voor kerkelijke en wereldsche geschiedenissen, inzonderheid van Utrecht*, vol. III, Utrecht: N. van der Monde.
- Doesschate, G. ten. 1963. *De Utrechtse Universiteit en de geneeskunde 1636–1900*, Nieuwkoop: De Graaf.
- Duker, A.C. 1861. *School-gezag en eigen-onderzoek (De pugna inter Voetium et Cartesium). Historisch-kritische studie van den strijd tusschen Voetius en Descartes*, Leiden: D. Noothoven van Goor (Ph.D. Diss. Universiteit Leiden).
- 1915. 'Gisbertus Voetius. Toevoegsels', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis/Dutch Review of Church History*, 12 (1915), 158–210.
- 1989. *Gisbertus Voetius*, 4 vols., Leiden: J.J. Groen en Zoon (reprint of: Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1897–1914).
- Esze, J. 1973. 'Deux documents inédits sur Descartes', *Acta Litteraria Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 15 (1973), 230–244.
- Evers, G.A. 1918. 'De Bijbel als Gevelsteen te Utrecht', *Bibliotheekleven*, 3 (1918), 4–10, 34–46.
- 1934–1935. 'Gegevens betreffende Utrechtse Staten-, Stads- en Akademiédrukkers. III. Akademiédrukkers', *Het Grafisch Museum*, 4 (1934), 28–32, 45–52, 61–68, 77–84, 93–100; 5 (1935), 9–16, 25–32, 49–52.
- 1938. 'Hoe de vroedschap in 1614 de jaarmarkt reorganiseerde', *Maandblad van 'Oud-Utrecht'*, 13 (1938), 79–82.
- Farina, P. 1975. 'Sulla Formazione scientifica di Henricus Regius: Santorio Santorio e il Statica Medicina,' *Rivista Critica di Storia della Filosofia*, 30 (1975), 363–399.
- 1977. 'Il corpuscolarismo di Henricus Regius: Materialismo e Medicina in un Cartesio olandese del Seicento', in U. Baldini, et al. (eds.), *Ricerche sull'Atomismo del seicento*, Atti del Convegno di Studio di Santa Margherita Ligure (14–16 ottobre 1976), Florence: La Nuova Italia, 119–178.
- Ferrier, F. 1973. 'Spontanéité et Liberté: la discussion Gibieuf–Descartes', *Les Études Philosophiques*, 28 (1973), 329–338.

Bibliography

- 1976. *La Pensée philosophique du Père Guillaume Gibieuf (1583–1650). Étude bibliographique*, 2 vols., Paris: H. Champion (Thèse de doctorat d'État, Université de Paris IV, 1974).
- Fowler, C.F. 1999. *Descartes on the Human Soul. Philosophy and the Demands of Christian Doctrine*, Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- French, R. 1989. 'Harvey in Holland: Circulation and the Calvinists', in R. French and A. Wear (eds.), *The medical Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 46–86.
- Fuchs, T. 1992. *Die Mechanisierung des Herzens. Harvey und Descartes – Der vitale und der mechanische Aspekt des Kreislaufs*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Gabbey, A. 1999. "'Playing the Descartes myself": Reflections on the Unfinished Descartes–More Correspondence', in ARMOGATHE/BELGIOIOSO/VINTI 1999, 317–331.
- Garber, D. and M. Ayers. (eds.). 1998. *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gariépy, T.P. 1990. *Mechanism without Metaphysics: Henricus Regius and the Establishment of Cartesian Medicine* (Ph.D. Diss. Yale University).
- Gaukroger, S. 1995. *Descartes. An Intellectual Biography*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Goudriaan, A. 1999. *Philosophische Gotteserkenntnis bei Suárez und Descartes, in Zusammenhang mit der niederländischen reformierten Theologie und Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Grene, M. 1993. 'The Heart and Blood: Descartes, Plemp, and Harvey', in VOSS 1993, 324–336.
- Grmek, M.D. 1990. *La première révolution biologique. Réflexions sur la physiologie et la médecine du XVIIe siècle*, Paris: Éditions Payot.
- Haan, A.A.M. de 1993. 'Geschiedenis van het wijsgerig onderwijs te Deventer', in BLOM 1993, 29–122.
- Heinekamp, A. 1970. 'Ein ungedruckter Brief Descartes' an Roderich Dotzen', *Studia Leibniziana*, 2 (1970), 1–12.
- Heyd, M. 1982. *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment. Jean- Robert Chouet and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy of Geneva*, The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- 1995. "Be Sober and Reasonable". *The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries*, Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill.
- Hohn, H.B. 1990. "De affectibus animi" 1650. *Die Affektlehre des Arztes Henricus Regius (1598-1679) und sein Verhältnis zu zeitgenössischen Philosophen*, Kölner medizinhistorische Beiträge, Bd. 54, Cologne: Forschungsstelle des Instituts für Geschichte der Medizin der Universität Köln (Ph.D. Diss. University of Cologne).
- Israel, J.I. 1995. *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness and Fall 1477–1806*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Israëls, A.H. and C.E. Daniëls. 1883. *De verdiensten der Hollandsche Geleerden ten opzichte van Harvey's leer van den bloedsomloop*, Utrecht: J.W. Leeflang.

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- Kernkamp, G.W. 1936. *De Utrechtse Academie 1636–1815*, Utrecht: A. Oosthoek's Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Koenhein, A.J.M., et al. (eds.). 1999. *Johan Wolfert van Brederode, 1599–1655: een Hollands edelman tussen Nassau en Oranje*, Zutphen: Walburg Pers.
- Koenhein, A.J.M. and J. Heniger. 1999. 'Johan Wolfert van Brederode', in KOENHEIN 1999, 9–46.
- Kramm, C. 1874. 'Renatus Descartes in Utrecht', *De Navorscher*, 24 (1874), 34–35.
- Lambrigts, M. 1989. 'Voetius versus Jansenius', in VAN OORT 1989, 148–167.
- Lenep, M.J. van. 1980. 'Bernardus Schotanus, jurist', *Gens Schotana*, II (1980), 87–91.
- Lennon, Th.M. 1995. 'Essence and Reference: Gassendi's Nominalist Objection and Descartes' Realist Reply', in ARIEW/GRENE 1995, 159–181.
- Lieburg, F.A. van. 1989. *De Nadere Reformatie in Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius: sporen in de gereformeerde kerkeradsacta*, Rotterdam: Lindenberg.
- Lindeboom, G.A. 1974. *Florentius Schuyt (1619–1669) en zijn betekenis voor het Cartesianisme in de geneeskunde*, Den Haag: M. Nijhoff.
- 1978. *Descartes and Medicine*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- 1993⁷. *Inleiding tot de geschiedenis der geneeskunde*, M.J. van Lieburg (ed.), Rotterdam: Erasmus Publishing.
- Loncq CJz, G.J. 1886. *Historische schets der Utrechtse Hoogeschool tot hare verheffing in 1815*, Utrecht: J.L. Beyers and J. van Broekhoven.
- Lüthy, Ch. 1997. 'Thoughts and Circumstances of Sébastien Basson. Analysis, Micro-history, Questions', *Early Science and Medicine*, 2 (1997), 1–73.
- 2001. 'David Gorlaeus' Atomism, or: the Marriage of Protestant Metaphysics with Italian Natural Philosophy', in Ch. Lüthy, J. Murdoch, and W. Newman (eds.), *Late Medieval and Early Modern Corpuscular Matter Theories*, Leiden: Brill, 245–290.
- McGahagan, Th.A. 1976. *Cartesianism in the Netherlands, 1639–1676; the New Science and the Calvinist Counter-Reformation* (Ph.D. Diss. University of Pennsylvania).
- Méchoulan, H. (ed.). 1988. *Problématique et réception du 'Discours de la méthode' et des 'Essais'*, Paris: J. Vrin.
- Monchamp, G. 1886. *Histoire du Cartésianisme en Belgique*, Bruxelles: F. Hayez.
- Muller Fzn., S. 1914. 'Het 'Forum Academicum' der Utrechtse Hoogeschool', in R. Fruin, et al. (eds.), *Rechtshistorische opstellen aangeboden aan Mr S.J. Fockema Andreae*, Haarlem: Erven J. Bohn, 219–238.
- Nauta, D. 1935. *Samuel Maresius*, Amsterdam: H.J. Paris (Ph.D. Diss. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam).
- 1980. 'Meinardus Schotanus, theoloog', *Gens Schotana*, II (1980), 61–71.
- Olivo, G. 1993. 'L'homme en personne', in VERBEEK 1993A, 69–91.
- Oort, J. van, et al. (eds.). 1989. *De onbekende Voetius. Voordrachten wetenschappelijk symposium Utrecht 3 maart 1989*, Kampen: J.H. Kok.
- Orcibal, J. 1989. *Jansénius d'Ypres (1585–1638)*, Études Augustiniennes, Paris.

Bibliography

- Osler, M.J. 1995. 'Divine Will and Mathematical Truth: Gassendi and Descartes on the Status of the Eternal Truths', in ARIEW/GRENE 1995, 145–158.
- Raa, F.J.G. ten and F. de Bas. 1911–1964. *Het Staatsche leger, 1568–1795*, 11 vols., Breda/The Hague: Koninklijke Militaire Academie/M. Nijhoff.
- Raymond, J.-F. de. 1999. *Pierre Chanut, ami de Descartes. Un diplomate philosophe*, Paris: Beauchesne.
- Rodis-Lewis, G. 1995. *Descartes. Biographie*, Paris: Calman-Lévy.
- Roth, L. 1937. 'The Descartes–Huygens Correspondence', in *Travaux du IXe Congrès International de Philosophie, Congrès Descartes*, R. Bayer (ed.), vol. II, Études Cartésiennes, Paris: Hermann et Cie, 101–108.
- Rothschuh, K.E. 1968. 'Henricus Regius und Descartes. Neue Einblicke in die frühe Physiologie (1640–1641) des Regius', *Archives Internationales d'Histoire des Sciences*, 21 (1968), 39–66.
- Ruestow, E.G. 1973. *Physics at Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Leiden*, The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Ruler, J.A. van. 1995. *The Crisis of Causality. Voetius and Descartes on God, Nature and Change*, Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill.
- Sassen, F.L.R. 1941. *Henricus Renerius, de eerste 'Cartesiaansche' hoogleeraar te Utrecht*, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- 1961. *Johannes Horthemels. De laatste "aristotelische" hoogleraar te Utrecht*, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- 1962. *Het wijsgerig onderwijs aan de Illustre School te Breda (1646–1669)*, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- 1963. *Het wijsgerig onderwijs aan de Illustre School te 's-Hertogenbosch (1636–1810)*, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- Schlüter, H.F. 1929. *Antonius Matthaeus II. aus Herborn, der Kriminalist des 17. Jahrhunderts, der Rechtslehrer Utrechts*, Breslau: Schletter.
- Schouten, J. 1972. *Johannes Walaeus. Zijn betekenis voor de verbreiding van de leer van de bloedsomloop*, Assen: Van Gorcum.
- 1974. 'Johannes Walaeus (1604–1649) and his Experiments on the Circulation of the Blood', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 29 (1974), 259–279.
- Schouten, J. and D. Goltz. 1977. 'James Primrose und sein Kampf gegen die Theorie vom Blutkreislauf', *Sudhoffs Archiv*, 61 (1977), 331–352.
- Schuhmann, K. 1997. 'Hobbes' Correspondence', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, 5 (1997), 121–149.
- Sebba, G. 1982. 'Adrien Baillet and the Genesis of His *Vie de M. Des-Cartes*', in Th. Lennon, J.M. Nicholas and J.W. Davis (eds.), *Problems of Cartesianism*, Kingston/Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 9–60.
- Sherrington, Ch. 1974. *The Endeavour of Jean Fernel, with a List of the Editions of his Writings*, Folkestone/London: Dawson's of Pall Mall (reprint of: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1946).
- Siegel, R.E. 1968. *Galen's System of Physiology and Medicine. An Analysis of his Doc-*

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

- trines and Observations on Bloodflow, Respiration, Humors and Internal Diseases*, Basel/New York: S. Karger.
- Sluis, J. van. 1988. *Herman Alexander Röell*, Ljouwert [Leeuwarden]: Fryske Akademy, Fryske Histoaryske Rige 4 (Ph.D. Diss. Groningen).
- Sortais, G. 1929. *Le Cartésianisme chez les Jésuites Français au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle*, *Archives de Philosophie*, 6 (1929), no. 3.
- 1937. ‘Descartes et la Compagnie de Jésus: menaces et avances, 1640–1646’, *Estudios*, 57 (1937), 441–468.
- Sprunger, K.L. 1982. *Dutch Puritanism. A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Tannery, P. 1912–1950. *Mémoires scientifiques de Paul Tannery*, J.-L. Heiberg et al. (eds.), 17 vols., Paris/Toulouse: Gauthier-Villars/E. Grivat.
- Thijssen-Schoute, C.L. 1953. ‘Andreas Colvius, een correspondent van Descartes’, *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis/Dutch Review of Church History*, 38 (1953), 224–248 (repr. in: C.L. Thijssen-Schoute, *Uit de republiek der letteren: elf studiën op het gebied der ideeëngeschiedenis van de Gouden Eeuw*, The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1967, 67–89).
- 1954. *Nederlands cartesianisme*, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Maatschappij (reprint: Utrecht: HES, 1989).
- Tordai, Z. 1964. ‘Esquisse de l’histoire du cartésianisme en Hongrie’, *Études sur Descartes*, *Studia philosophica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 6, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 135–168.
- Tóth, B. 1981. ‘Descartes és Debrecen’, *A Debreceni Déri Múzeum Évkönyve/Annales Musei Debreceniensis de Friderico Déri Nominati*, 60 (1979), 419–437.
- Trevisani, F. 1992. *Descartes in Germania. La ricezione del cartesianesimo nella Facoltà filosofica e medica di Duisburg (1652–1703)*, Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- Turóczi-Trostler, J. 1934. ‘Les cartésiens hongrois’, *Revue des Études Hongroises*, 12 (1934), 100–125.
- Verbeek, Th. 1989. ‘Les passions et la fièvre. L’idée de la maladie chez Descartes et quelques cartésiens néerlandais’, *Tractrix*, 1 (1989), 45–61.
- 1992a. *Descartes and the Dutch. Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy 1637–1650*, Carbondale/Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- 1992b. ‘Ens per accidens’: le origini della *Querelle* di Utrecht’, *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana*, 71 (1992), 276–288.
- 1993a. *Descartes et Regius. Autour de l’Explication de l’esprit humain*, Th. Verbeek (ed.), *Studies in the History of Ideas in the Low Countries* 2, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 1993b. ‘Le contexte historique des *Notae in programma quoddam*’, in VERBEEK 1993A, 1–33.
- 1993c. ‘Henricus Reneri’, in BLOM 1993, 123–134.
- 1993d. ‘*Une université pas encore corrompue ...*’, *Descartes et les premières années de l’Université d’Utrecht/Descartes en de eerste jaren van de Utrechtse Universiteit*, Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht.

Bibliography

- 1993e. 'From 'Learned Ignorance' to Scepticism: Descartes and Calvinist Orthodoxy', in R.H. Popkin and A. Vanderjagt (eds.), *Scepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 31–45.
- 1994. 'Regius's *Fundamenta physices*', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 55 (1994), 533–551.
- 1995. 'Gassendi et ses correspondents néerlandais', in M.M. Vire (ed.), *Quadricentenaire de la naissance de Pierre Gassendi 1592–1655*, Actes du Colloque International Pierre Gassendi, Digne-les-Bains 18–21 Mai 1992, 2 vols., Digne-les-Bains: Société scientifique et littéraire des Alpes de Haute-Provence, vol. 1, 99–110.
- 1999. 'Descartes et Regius: 'Juin 1642', autour de la lettre CCLXXX', in ARMOGATHE/BELGIOIOSO/VINTI 1999, 93–109.
- 2000. 'The invention of nature. Descartes and Regius', in S. Gaukroger, J. Schuster, and J. Sutton (eds.), *Descartes' Natural Philosophy*, London: Routledge, 149–167.
- Voss, S. (ed) 1993. *Essays on the Philosophy and Science of René Descartes*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vrijer, M.J.A. de. 1917. *Henricus Regius. Een 'cartesiaansch' hoogleraar aan de Utrechtsche hoogeschool*, The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- 1929. 'Henricus Regius' "Responsio"", *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis/Dutch Review of Church History*, 22 (1929), 105–118.
- Vrugt, M. van de. 1986. 'Antonius Matthaeus II (1601–1654). Utrechts eerste primarius iuris', in VAN DEN BERGH/SPRUIT/VAN DE VRUGT 1986, 23–36.
- Waard, C. de. 1947. 'Descartes et Regius. A propos d'une lettre ouverte peu connue adressée à Descartes', *Revue philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger*, 137 (1947), 344–356.
- Wang, L. 1963. 'A controversial biography: Baillet's *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*', *Romanische Forschungen*, 75 (1963), 316–331.
- Wansink, H. 1981. *Politieke wetenschappen aan de Leidse Universiteit 1575—1650*, Utrecht: HES.
- Welten, R. 1987. 'Utrechtse hoogleraren in de rechten (1636–1815). Enkele aspecten van de geschiedenis van de rechtenfaculteit te Utrecht', *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, 60 (1987), 67–101.

Concordances on CLE (1657), CLE (1663), AT and the present edition

CLE (1657)	CLE (1663)	CLE (1663)	AT
81	84	81	190
82	85	85	239
83	86	84	240
84	87	82	252
85	88	83	253
86	93	86	255
87	94	87	256
88	81	88	257
89	95	90	258
90	82	91	264
91	83	89	266
92	90	92	270
93	91	93	272
94	89	94	277
95	92	95	280
96	96	96	387
97	97	97	391
98	98	98	394

AT	Present edition	AT	Present edition
136	1	264	40
158	3	265	30
159	4, 5	266	31, 33
164	6	268	32
169	7	269	36
172	8	270	39
176	9	271	37
178	10	272	38
181	5, 11	276	41
188	12	277	42
190	13, 15, 22, 23, 27	278	43
191	14	280	45
209	16	281	44, 46, 47, 49
238	18, 30	340	50
239	19A	350	51, 52
240	19B, 20	361	53, 54
252	26	385	55
253	28	387	17
255	21	388	56
256	24	391	57
257	25	393	58
258	29	394	59

Present edition	AT	Present edition	AT
1	136	30	238-II, 265
2	—	31	266-I
3	158	32	268
4	159-I	33	266-II
5	181-I, 159-II	34	—
6	164	35	—
7	169	36	269
8	172	37	271
9	176	38	272
10	178	39	270
11	181-II	40	264
12	188	41	276
13	190-V	42	277
14	191	43	278
15	190-I	44	281-I
16	209	45	280
17	387	46	281-II
18	238-I	47	281-III
19A	239	48	—
19B	240-I	49	281-IV
20	240-II	50	340
21	255	51	350-I
22	190-II	52	350-II
23	190-III	53	361-I
24	256	54	361-II
25	257	55	385
26	252	56	388
27	190-IV	57	391
28	253	58	393
29	258	59	394

INDEX OF SPECIAL SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THE COMMENTARY

1. The first contact between Descartes and Regius	7
2. Regius' appointment at the University of Utrecht	8
3. Æmilius' funeral oration for Reneri	18
4. The Stampioen-affair	22
5. Florentius Schuyt's disputation <i>pro gradu</i>	24
6. Regius' course on physical problems (<i>Problemata</i>)	39
7. A Cartesian textbook of natural philosophy	40
8. Regius' disputation <i>Pro sanguinis circulatione</i> (10/20 June 1640)	46
9. The polemic between Regius and Primrose	56
10. Regius' disputations <i>De illustribus aliquot quaestionibus physiologicis</i>	92
11. Picot and the Utrecht students of Descartes' <i>Géométrie</i>	120
12. The Senate's and the Vroedschap's reaction to Regius' <i>Responsio</i>	127
13. Regius and Sorbière	143
14. Vanden Waterlaet's <i>Prodromus sive Examen tutulare orthodoxae philosophiae principiorum</i>	145
15. The affair of the Brotherhood of the Holy Virgin	161
16. Schoock's <i>Admiranda methodus novae philosophiae cartesianae</i>	161
17. The condemnation of Descartes' <i>Epistola ad Patrem Dinet</i> and <i>Epistola ad Voetium</i>	169
18. Mercurius and Theophilus Cosmopolita	170
19. Descartes and the Utrecht Vroedschap 1645–1648	183

INDEX OF NAMES

A boldface pagenumber signifies that information on the person named is contained in the *Biographical Lexicon*.

- Adam, Ch. *passim*
Æmilius, Antonius *xl, xlviii*, 3, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 32, 33, 34, 38, 45, 50, 51, 53, 107, 108, 110, 125, 128, 142, 144, 165, **249**
Aesope 113
Ahsmann, M. *li*
Alphonse; *see* Alphonse Pollot
Amalia van Solms 8, 251
Andala, Ruardus *xlii*
Andreae, Tobias *xviii, xxi, xxiii, xxiv, xxvii, xxviii, xxxi*
Apáczai, János Csere *xliii*
Apáti, Miklos 171
Apelles 153
Aristotle 18, 115, 146, 151
Armogathe, J.-R. *xxxviii*
Aselli, Gaspare 44, 70
Aucante, V. 90

Bacon, Francis *li*
Baillet, Adrien *passim*
Balzac, Guy de *xxv*
Bannius, Joan Albert 175, 179
Barlaeus, Caspar *xlix*, 250
Bartholin, Thomas 47, 70, 255
Basso, Sebastian 94
Batelier, Jean 152

Beeckman, Abraham 48
Beeckman, Isaac 16, 48, 249
Belgioioso, G. *xxxviii*
Berckringer, Daniel *l*, 142, 165
Berlicom, Andries van 22
Beverwijck, Johan van *xxv, xxvi, xxx*, 35, 176, **249**
Bitbol-Hespériès, A. 64
Block, Jacob; *see* Jacobus Blockius
Blocquius, Jacobus 66, 94, 195
Bloemaert, Augustin 179
Bom, G.D. 125
Boom, Hendrik *xxii*
Bootius, Arnold 146, 147
Bootius, Gerard 146, 147
Bordoli, R. *xiv*, 11, 44, 56
Borel, Pierre 250
Bornius, Henricus 15, 182
Bouillier, F. *xii-xiii*
Bourdin, Pierre 152
Brasset, Henri *xxxi*
Brederode, Johan Wolphaert van 160, 161
Breger, H. 120
Bruinvisch, Cornelis 48, 60, 61, 94, 168, 195
Bruyn, Johannes de *li*

Descartes—Regius Correspondence

- Buchell, Arnold van 19
Buzon, F. de 121
- Camp, I. 60
Cartesius, Renatus; *see* René Descartes
Casaubon, Isaac xxx
Cavendish, William, Duke of Newcastle 42
Chanut, Adrien xv
Chanut, Pierre, xv, xvi, xviii, xix, xxiii, xxiv, xxv, xxviii, xxxi, xxxiv
Charles I 28
Charles II xix
Chouet, Jean-Robert xxiii
Christiaens van der Boxe, Willem 54, 144, 146, 157
Christina, Queen of Sweden xvi
Ciermans, Joseph xxv
Clerselier, Cathérine xv
Clerselier, Claude *passim*
Clerselier, Marguerite xv
Cole, J. xxxvi
Colvius, Andreas xvi, liv, 145, 147
Copernicus, Nicholas li
Costabel, P. 121
Creighton, Robert xviii, xix
- Daedalus 103
Dályai Vas, Johannes xli, xlii–xliii
Dam, Peter van 174
Davidson, P. xvi
Dedel, Nicolas 22, 28
- Dematius, Carolus xlix, 54, 60, 110, 112, 126, 128, 142, 165, 168
Descartes, René *passim*
Desmarets, Samuel; *see* Samuel Maresius
Deusing, Arnold 5
Dibon, P. xiii, xvi, xviii, xxix, xxx, xxxi, xlvi, 109, 123–124, 137, 196
Diemberbroeck, Ysbrand van l
Digby, Kenelm 182
Dinet, Jacques 152, 163, 178, 183
Doorn, Jan Evertsz. 126
Dotzen, Roderich 120
Duker, A.C. 140
- Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia xxv, 181
Elizabeth, Princess of Bohemia xvi, xxiii, xxiv, xxv, xxvi, xxviii, xxxi xxxiv, 112, 141, 176, 182
Elsevier, Lodewijk 89
Esze, J. xiv, xlii, xlvi, 123
Eversdijck, M. 196
- Fabricius, Carolus xviii, xix, xx, xxvii
Farina, P. xiii
Fekete, Cs., xliii
Fernel, Jean 46, 208
Fowler, C. xiii, 63
Fransintgen liv, 49
Frederik Hendrik l, 30, 112, 160, 170, 185, 251
Froidmont, Libert; *see* Libertus Fromondus
Fromondus, Libertus 6

Index of Names

- Gabbey, A. *xxii*, *xxv*
Galen 67, 144, 150, 151, 200
Galilei, Galileo *xi*, *li*
Gariepy, Th. *xiii*, 81, 196
Gassendi, Pierre 15, 151, 172, 174, 181, 182
Gent, Pieter van *xxii*
Gibieuf, Guillaume 52, 140
Gilson, É. 3
Goirle, David van; *see* David Gorlaeus
Golius, Jacobus 22, 30, 31, 44, 49, 117, 146, 148, 157, **249**
Gool, Jacob; *see* Jacobus Golius
Goor, Arnoldus van *xliv*, *l*
Gorlaeus, David 93, 94, 95, 111, 118
Gouhier, H. *xxvii*
Goyer, Anthonis de 39
Graevius, Johannes G. 6
Grmek, M. 42

Habert, Germain *xxxiii*
Haestrecht, Charles Otto 250
Haestrecht, Dirk van 250
Haestrecht, Godefroot (Goyert) van 73, 120, 121, 174, 1178, 179, 180, **250**
Haestrecht, Isabella Maria van 250
Harvey, William 28, 41, 46, 56, 70, 92
Hayman, Johannes 48, 60, 72, 74, 104, 195
Heereboord, Adriaan *lii*, 145, 147, 170, 172
Heinekamp, A. 120
Helmont, Jean Baptiste 42
Heurnius, Johannes 6
Heydanus, Abraham 30, 31, 141, **250**
Heyden, Abraham van der; *see* Abraham Heydanus
Hippocrates 6, 144, 150, 151
Hobbes, Thomas 143
Hogelande, Cornelis van *xxi*, *xxii*, *xxiii*, *xl*, 47, 143, 178, 179, 180, **250**
Hoog(h)elande, Cornelis van; *see* Cornelis van Hogenlande
Hoolck, Gijsbert van der 8, 16, 21, 55, 56, 73, 89, 94, 97, 106, 107, 108, 110, 127, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, **251**
Hoornbeeck, Johannes *xliv*
Horace 193
Horn, Johannes van 78, 92, 111, 195
Huygens, Christiaan *xvi*, 253
Huygens, Constantijn *xvi*, *xxvi*, *xxix*, *xxxii*, *xxxvi*, *liv*, 7, 8, 10, 23, 29, 35, 98, 110, 145, 160, 163, 165, 170, 181, 183, 253
Huygens, Maurits *xxix*

James I 28
Jans, Helena *liv*
Jansenius, Cornelius 166
Johnson, Samson 181-182

Keblusek, M. *xix*
Kramm, C. *liii*

La Forge, Louis de 70
La Hire, Philippe de *xxii*
Labadie, Jean de 253

Descartes—Regius Correspondence

- Leemans, Cornelis 158, 159, 160, 161
Leeuwen, Peter van 106-107, 174
Legrand, Jean-Baptiste *xxii*, *xxiii*, *xxiv*,
xxxviii, *xxxix*, *xl*
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm 121
Lemannus, Cornelius; *see* Cornelis
Leemans
Liere, Joost van; *see* Justus Liraeus
Lipstorp, Daniel 21, 176
Liraeus (Lyraeus), Justus *xlvi*, 8, 54,
60, 126, 128, 142, 165
Loon, Henricus van 48, 60, 93, 94
Louise, Princess of Bohemia *xxi*
Lüthy, Ch. 93

Maet, Aletta van der *xl*
Maets, Charles de; *see* Carolus Dematius
Maire, Jan *liii*, 3, 28, 44, 54, 89
Malsen, Anna van 250
Mansveld, Reinier van *liii*
Maresius, Samuel 158, 159, 160, 161,
168, 254
Marmion *xxii*, *xxiv*, *xxxviii*
Matthaeus, Antonius *xlvi*, 9, 126, 128,
141, 142, 165
Melis, Antonius; *see* Antonius Æmilius
Mercurius Cosmopolita 170, 171
Mersenne, Marin *xxi*, *xxii*, *xxv*, *xxxi*, *xxxiii*,
xxxiv, *xxxvii*, *xxxviii*, *liv*, 3, 4, 6, 8,
10, 19, 38, 40, 42, 44, 47, 50, 89,
110, 117, 121, 143, 145, 163, 166,
170, 175, 176, 178, 183
Mesland, Denise *xxxiv*
Meurs, Arnold 171

Micheli, G. 68, 69, 73, 78, 79, 195, 196
Milhaud, G. *xiv*, *xl*, 108, 121
More, Henry *xxiv*, *xxv*, *xxvi*, *xxviii*, *xxx*
Moreelse, Henrick *l*
Morin, Jean-Baptiste *xxv*, *xxvi*, *xxx*, *xxxi*
Mory, Abraham de 160

Newcastle; *see* William Cavendish
Niçaise, Claude *xxxix*

Olivo, G. 93
Otegem, M. van *xxiv*

Pandelaert, Bernardus 92
Parisanus, Æmilius 28
Parmentier, Anthony Charles 174
Peut, Christina 174
Picot, Claude *xxiii*, *xxxvii*, *liv*, 119-121,
143, 150, 155, 176, 178, **251**
Plato 18
Plautus *xxxii*
Plemp(ius), Vopiscus Fortunatus *xxv*,
xxvi, *xxx*, *liv*, 6, 33, 34-36, 43, 46,
64, 180, 249, **251**
Ploos van Amstel, Henrica 174
Pollot, Jean-Alphonse 8, 15, 30, 98,
110, 112, 120, 155, 163, **251**
Pollot, Jean-Baptiste 251
Prat, Abraham du 47, 143
Primrose, James 28, 54, 55, 56, 60
Pueteman, Petrus 60, 92

Raey, Johannes de 9, 60, 64, 120, 195,
196, **252**

Index of Names

- Ravensberger, Jacobus *l, li, 92, 111, 120*
- Regius, Henricus *passim*
- Regneri ab Oosterga, Cyprianus *l, 128, 142, 144, 165, 252*
- Reneri(us), Henricus *xxxiii, xlviii, l, li, liii, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 32, 33, 98, 120, 252*
- Revius, Jacobus 172
- Rivet, André, *liii, 110-111, 160*
- Roberval, Gilles de *xxii*
- Rodis-Lewis, G. *xiv, 109*
- Röell, Dionysius *xlii*
- Röell, Herman Alexander *xli, xlii, xliii*
- Röell, Johannes *xlii*
- Roman, Aegidius 33
- Rossum, van 121
- Roth, L. *xvi, xxix, xxxii, 7, 22*
- Rothschuh, K. *xiii, 68, 195, 196*
- Roy, Hendrick de; *see* Henricus Regius
- Roy, Henry le; *see* Henricus Regius
- Roy, Hugo de 30
- Roy, Maria de 26, 155, 174
- Ruler, H. van *xiii*
- Ruysch, Frederik 39, 89, 131
- Santorii, Santorio 42, 220
- Saumaise, Claude *li, 253*
- Schagen, Franciscus van der 43
- Schoock, Martin *xlix, l, 18, 40, 121, 148, 158, 161-162, 166, 167, 168, 169, 183, 185, 190, 252-253*
- Schooten Jr., Frans van *xxxiv, 176*
- Schooten Sr., Frans van 22, 44, 49
- Schotanus, Bernardus *xlvi, xlix, l, 8, 22, 37, 46, 120*
- Schotanus, Meinardus *xlix, 61, 66, 93, 110, 111, 142, 165*
- Schoten, Bernard van; *see* Bernardus Schotanus
- Schuhmann, K. 143
- Schurman, Anna Maria van *liii, 45, 49, 110, 143, 162, 253*
- Schurman, Johan Godschalk van 1162, 253
- Schuyf, Florentius 23, 24-25
- Sebba, G. *xxxvi, xxxviii, xxxix*
- Senguerdus, Arnoldus *xlix, l, 24, 25, 37, 39, 58, 142, 149, 165*
- Serrurier, Joseph *xliii*
- Servien, Abel *xxiii*
- Soly, Michel 38, 39
- Sophie, Princess of Bohemia *xxxi, xxxix*
- Sorbière, Samuel de 31, 89, 141, 143, 150, 174, 181
- Spruyt, Franck 170, 171
- Stampioen de Jongere, Johan Jansz. 21, 22, 28, 29, 45, 49, 122, 123, 131, 170, 253
- Stampioen, Jan Jansz. 21
- Straaten, Willem van der; *see* Willem Stratenus
- Stratenus, Willem *xlix, 37, 93, 142, 165*
- Stuart, Adam 172
- Suavius, Andreas *xlix*
- Surck, Anthony Studler van 57, 67, 176, 177, 178, 179, 254
- Swammerdam, Jan 47

Descartes—Regius Correspondence

- Swart, Maria de 3, 26, 155, 174
- Sylvius, Franciscus de le Boe 43, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, **253-254**
- Szárosi, János *xlii*
- Tannery, P. *passim*
- Taurellus, Nicolaus 93, 94, 95, 117, 118
- Terence 108
- Terlon, Hugues de *xxiii*
- Theophilus Cosmopolita 168, 169, 170-171
- Tönkö, Martinus *xliii*
- Trevisani, F. 44, 70
- Trigland, Jacob 172
- Trincavellius, Victorius 6
- Tschirnhaus, Ehrenfried Walther von *xxii*
- Vatier, Antoine, *xxxiv*
- Velthuysen, Anna van 15
- Verbeek, Th. *xii*, *xvi*, 58-59, 68, 92, 145, 155-156, 163
- Verwey, Jacob 28, 29
- Villebressieu, Étienne de *xxiii*
- Vissonatus, Andreas 143
- Vitringa, Campegius *xlii*
- Vivien, Elisabeth 174
- Vliegen, Eva 211
- Voet, Daniel 254
- Voet, Paulus, *xlix*, *l*, 61, 142, 144, 157, 167, 171, **254**
- Voetius, Gisbertus **254-255**, *et passim*
- Vorstius, Conrad 93, 174
- Vrijer, M.J.A. de *xii*, 54, 60, 66, 110, 112, 126, 128, 142, 165, 168
- Waal, Johannes de; *see* Johannes Walaeus
- Waard, C. de *xiii*, 41, 125
- Walaeus, Johannes 41, 44, 46, 56, 70, 78, 255
- Wassenaer Sr., Jacobus van 21, 29, 255
- Wassenaer, Jacobus van 21, 22, 28, 29, 44-45, 49, 73, 120, 253, **255**
- Wassenaer, Petrus *xx*, **255**
- Waterlaet, Lambertus vanden 96, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 152, 154, 155, 157, 162, 168, **255-256**
- Weel, A. van der *xvi*
- Wilhem, David le Leu de 4, 23, 98, 112, 160, 170
- William II 110, 253
- Witt, Johan de *xvi*
- Wolffen, Johannes *xlii*
- Worp, J. *xvi*
- Zemlényi, Zsuzsánna *xlii*
- Zuylichem; *see*: Constantijn Huygens
- Zwaardcroon de Jonge, Wolfard *xx*

SAMENVATTING

Dit proefschrift behelst een kritische uitgave van de briefwisseling tussen de Utrechtse hoogleraar in de theoretische geneeskunde Henricus Regius (1598–1679) en de Franse wijsgeer René Descartes (1596–1650). In 1638 introduceerde Regius zich bij de Franse filosoof omdat hij, zoals hij in zijn eerste brief schreef, meende dat hij zijn aanstelling als buitengewoon hoogleraar te danken had aan zijn kennis van de Cartesiaanse filosofie. In de jaren die volgden, ontwikkelde Regius zich tot de belangrijkste voorstander van Descartes' gedachtengoed binnen de Nederlandse academische wereld. In feite was hij de eerste universitaire docent die openlijk de 'Nieuwe Filosofie' propageerde en zijn samenvatting van de cartesiaanse natuurfilosofie in een aantal disputaties neerlegde. In de winter van 1641 en 1642 resulteerde dit in een crisis binnen de Utrechtse academie, welke uiteindelijk uitmondde in een formele veroordeling van het Cartesianisme. In 1645 informeerde Regius Descartes over zijn voornemen een boek te publiceren over natuurfilosofie. Ondanks het dreigement van de Franse filosoof zich openlijk tegen Regius en zijn werk uit te spreken, voerde de Utrechtse professor zijn plan uit. De publicatie van *Fundamenta physices* (1646) luidde dan ook het einde van hun vriendschap in.

Karakterisering van de briefwisseling

In de briefwisseling tussen Descartes en Regius kunnen we drie episodes onderscheiden. De eerste episode beslaat de jaren 1638 tot 1642, waarin het belangrijkste thema in de briefwisseling de teksten vormen die Regius voornemens was tijdens openbare disputaties te laten verdedigen door zijn studenten. Uit zijn brieven blijkt, dat Descartes de hem toegezonden teksten nauwkeurig bestudeerde en Regius voorzag van zijn commentaar met de nodige correcties en suggesties. In de eerste ons overgeleverde brief van Descartes aan Regius stelt hij voor de disputatie — over de Cartesiaanse opvatting van de bloedsomloop en de werking van het hart (REGIUS 1640A) — persoonlijk bij te wonen, met dien verstande dat hij plaats kan nemen in de loge van Anna Maria van Schurman, zodat hij aanwezig kan zijn zonder zelf opgemerkt te worden. Of Descartes inderdaad de disputatie bijwoonde, is helaas niet bekend. In het voorjaar van 1641 startte Regius een serie disputaties over natuurfilosofie in medische zin, waarin hij stelselmatig de Aristotelische wijsbegeerte op de korrel nam (REGIUS 1641A). Ook de teksten van deze disputaties zond Regius naar Descartes, zij het dat hij ze somtijds, zoals ik heb vastgesteld, pas liet zien nadat ze gedrukt waren. Van zijn kant stuurde Descartes zijn manuscript van de *Meditationes* (1641) naar Regius voor commentaar.

De tweede episode in de correspondentie begint met Regius' tweede serie disputaties voor het jaar 1641, waarin de Stichtse hoogleraar het Copernicaanse wereldbeeld en zijn kritiek op het Aristotelisme puntig samenvatte (REGIUS 1641B). De opschudding die deze disputaties veroorzaakten en uit zorg over de aantrekkingskracht van de

Descartes–Regius Correspondence

‘Nieuwe Filosofie’ juist ook op de theologische studenten, noodzaakten de professor in de Godgeleerdheid Gisbertus Voetius tot een verdediging van het Aristotelisme. Regius meende hierop te moeten antwoorden, en samen met Descartes — tijdens een gespannen briefwisseling — formuleerde hij een tegengeschrift welke eind februari 1642 het licht zag (REGIUS 1642). Ten zeerste ontstemd over deze publikatie verzocht de academische senaat aan de Vroedschap van Utrecht het werk bij de boekhandelaar te laten ophalen, en passende maatregelen te nemen tegen Regius. De Vroedschap gaf hieraan gehoor en tenslotte werd Regius in maart te verstaan gegeven, dat de speciale toestemming die hij eerder had gekregen om als medisch hoogleraar over natuurfilosofische onderwerpen te mogen doceren werd ingetrokken, en dat hij zich in zijn lessen diende te beperken tot de uitlegging van de klassieke geneeskunde. Van al deze ontwikkelingen hield Regius Descartes op de hoogte, en in zijn antwoorden spreekt de filosoof hem bemoedigend toe. Echter, nadat Regius de mond was gesnoerd en bovendien de Cartesiaanse filosofie officieel verboden was, mengde Descartes zich persoonlijk in de strijd. In zijn *Epistola ad Patrem Dinet* (1642) ging hij uitvoerig op de Utrechtse kwestie in. De tweede episode eindigt in de zomer van 1642 met Regius’ rapporteringen over de verontwaardiging van Voetius.

In de laatste episode, van de tweede helft van 1642 tot de zomer van 1645, neemt de frequentie van de briefwisseling zienderogen af. In eerste instantie voorziet Regius Descartes nog van het nodige materiaal ten behoeve van Descartes’ persoonlijke aanval op Voetius, diens *Epistola ad Voetium* (1643), maar daarna lijkt de correspondentie af te stevenen op de uitwisseling van vriendschappelijke beleefdheden. In de zomer van 1645 leeft de briefwisseling nog één maal op als Regius het manuscript van *Fundamenta physices* opstuurt. Vergeefs ontraadt Descartes hem de publikatie ervan. Hun beider laatste brieven vormen een ontluisterend einde van de vriendschap.

Bronnenproblematiek

Voor de briefwisseling tussen Regius en Descartes zijn we vrijwel helemaal afhankelijk van 17de-eeuwse gedrukte bronnen; slechts een kopie van twee korte brieven aan Regius is in manuscript bewaard gebleven (de kopie werd in 1973 ontdekt te Debrecen, Hongarije). Descartes’ overige brieven aan Regius zijn bekend uit de brievenuitgave verzorgd door Claude Clerselier (*Lettres de Mr Descartes*, dl. 1, 1657 (1ste editie), 1663 (2de editie)). Voor wat betreft Regius’ kant van de correspondentie zijn we aangewezen op aanhalingen, samenvattingen en verwijzingen naar zijn brieven in de laat 17de-eeuwse biografie van Descartes vervaardigd door Adrien Baillet (*Vie*, 1691). Tenslotte bevat het zogenaamde *Exemplaire de l’Institut* enkele waardevolle aantekeningen betreffende Regius’ brieven.

In zijn uitgave nam Clerselier achttien brieven op gericht aan de Utrechtse hoogleeraar. Ze zijn alle zonder datum, en van enkele brieven gaf de editeur aan dat hij ze niet volledig bezat. Dat moge geen verwondering wekken, immers, de originele brieven

Samenvatting

berustten bij Regius, en Clerselier kon slechts teruggrijpen op het materiaal dat Descartes zelf bewaard had van zijn correspondentie met zijn Utrechtse vriend. Bovendien, zo meldt Clerselier in zijn inleiding, waren de manuscripten uit Descartes' nalatenschap somtijds beschadigd of slecht leesbaar, en, ernstiger nog, in een grote wanorde.

Voor zijn biografie van Descartes kon Baillet beschikken over het materiaal van Clerselier. Hieronder bevond zich ook een collectie van kopiën van de brieven van Regius, 34 in getal. Baillet maakte dankbaar gebruik van deze bron, en liet niet na in de marge van zijn omvangrijke werk plichtsgetrouw te verwijzen naar de collectie, meestal onder vermelding van het nummer van de brief alsmede de datum ervan. Echter, de korte tijdspanne waarin Baillet het werk schreef, werkte vergissingen en verkeerde interpretaties in de hand. Daarnaast geeft de biograaf niet altijd even duidelijk aan op welke passages of zinsneden zijn verwijzingen nu precies betrekking hebben. Tenslotte is Baillet's onbekendheid met de Noordelijke Nederlanden de oorzaak van meerdere onjuistheden in de biografie.

Karakterisering van de voorliggende editie

In de standaardeditie van Descartes' briefwisseling, bezorgd door Adam en Tannery, is de volgorde van de brieven aan Regius nog essentieel die van Clerselier. Van verschillende brieven geven de moderne editoren aan dat er getwijfeld mag worden aan de tekstuele eenheid ervan, maar zonder verdere bronnen, bleek het onmogelijk hierover concrete uitspraken te doen. De aanleiding voor het uitvoeren van nieuw onderzoek naar de correspondentie tussen Descartes en Regius is de recente beschikbaarheid van alle disputaties die Regius in 1640 en 1641 hield aan de Universiteit Utrecht. Aan de hand van de teksten van deze disputaties is het mogelijk gebleken de brieven uit die jaren veel preciezer te dateren. Uit mijn onderzoek is daarnaast naar voren gekomen, dat verschillende door Clerselier uitgegeven teksten werden samengesteld uit fragmenten van meerdere brieven. In één dramatisch geval bleek een 'brief' te bestaan uit fragmenten van liefst vijf verschillende brieven. Ook met betrekking tot de brieven uit 1642 ben ik voor wat betreft tekstuele eenheid en dateringen der brieven tot geheel andere conclusies gekomen dan Adam en Tannery. Tijdens mijn onderzoek bleven ook de brieven van Regius niet ongemoeid. Niet alleen bleek de biografie van Baillet referenties te bevatten die niet worden aangetroffen in de standaardeditie, ook ben ik erin geslaagd de dateringen van een aantal brieven nader te preciseren. Daarenboven resulteerde mijn inspectie van het *Exemplaire de l'Institut* nieuwe gegevens op. Tenslotte kon ik met behulp van de gewonnen inzichten ook de interpretatie van de brieven die in Debrecen werden teruggevonden, herzien.

Deze nieuwe editie van de briefwisseling tussen Descartes en Regius biedt een instrument tot nader onderzoek naar de intrigerende verhouding tussen de Franse wijsgeer en de Stichtse professor. Bovenal brengt ze evident aan het licht, dat nauwgezette studie van 17de-eeuwse bronnen nieuw licht kan werpen op de briefwisseling van Descartes.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Erik-Jan Bos werd geboren op 10 februari 1969 te Boxtel. In 1987 legde hij met goed gevolg het eindexamen Gymnasium-B af aan het Jacob Roelandslyceum in Boxtel. Van 1987 tot 1996 studeerde hij filosofie aan de Universiteit Utrecht. In juni 1996 behaalde hij het doctoraalexamen wijsbegeerte met als specialisatie Geschiedenis van de Nieuwere Wijsbegeerte. Zijn doctoraalscriptie werd gehonoreerd met de jaarlijkse scriptieprijs van de Faculteit der Wijsbegeerte. Een handelseditie van de scriptie verscheen in hetzelfde jaar. Van maart 1997 tot juni 2001 was hij werkzaam als Onderzoeker In Opleiding bij de vakgroep Geschiedenis van de Filosofie van de Faculteit der Wijsbegeerte in Utrecht. Hij publiceerde artikelen over de tekstgeschiedenis van Descartes' werken, en gaf verschillende onbekende brieven van Voetius uit. Begin 2002 verscheen zijn kritische tekstuitgave van Descartes' *La recherche de la vérité* te Milaan.