BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

THOUGH I try not to assume that readers will have much background in philosophy, I do assume that they will have a copy of the Ethics at hand, will have tried to understand it, and are prepared to try harder. Being human, I hope they have the translation contained in my edition of Spinoza’s works (The Collected Works of Spinoza, vol. 1, Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985), but I generally adopt a way of referring to Spinoza’s text which will work no matter what edition they use. Most passages can be identified quickly enough using the following system of abbreviations:

\[\begin{align*}
E &= \text{the Ethics} \\
KV &= \text{the Short Treatise} \\
TDIE &= \text{the Treatise on the Emendation of the Intellect} \\
PP &= \text{Descartes’ “Principles of Philosophy” (i.e., Spinoza’s attempt to put Descartes’ Principles in geometric form)} \\
CM &= \text{the Metaphysical Thoughts} \\
Ep &= \text{Spinoza’s correspondence} \\
OP &= \text{Opera posthuma} \\
NS &= \text{Nagelate Schriften (the Dutch translation of the OP, which also appeared in 1677)} \\
i, ii, iii, etc., & \text{refer to parts of the work cited} \\
A &= \text{axiom} \\
P &= \text{proposition} \\
D \text{ (following a roman numeral)} &= \text{definition} \\
1, 2, 3, etc., & \text{refer to axioms, definitions, propositions, etc.} \\
D \text{ (following } P + \text{ an arabic numeral)} &= \text{the demonstration of the proposition}
\end{align*}\]
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c = corollary
s = scholium
Post = postulate
L = lemma
Exp = explanation
Pref = Preface
App = Appendix
DefAff = the definitions of the affects at the end of Part III

So "E IDI" refers to the first definition of Part I, "E IIIPI15C" to the corollary to proposition 15 of Part III, etc. Where that form of reference will not quickly locate the passage cited, I generally add volume, page and line numbers from the Gebhardt edition, which are given in the margins of my edition. For the TdIE and the kV, I make use of the section numbers given in my edition of the works.

For years we have not had a really satisfactory edition of Descartes' works in English, but now I think we can recommend The Philosophical Writings of Descartes, edited by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985, 2 vols.). This edition (CSM, for short) gives the Adam and Tannery pagination in the margins, and normally I shall simply use that pagination to make references to Descartes' works, whenever the passage in question is in CSM. The general reader should find CSM sufficient for most purposes. When I need to refer to a passage not in CSM, as I sometimes do, I use Kenny's edition of the correspondence (Descartes, Philosophical Letters, Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, 1981, abbreviated as k), the Millers' edition of the Principles of Philosophy (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1983, abbreviated as MM), and Cottingham's edition of the Conversation with Burman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976, abbreviated as c). But passages in the Principles are generally identified most readily by part and section numbers. Similarly, I normally re-
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fer to the Passions of the Soul (abbreviated PA) by section numbers.

The study of Hobbes is handicapped by the fact that as of this writing there is no satisfactory standard edition of his works. For generations scholars have relied on the 19th edition by Molesworth, but that is now being replaced by the Clarendon edition under the editorship of Howard Warrender. So far only two volumes of the latter (the Latin and English versions of De Cive) have appeared. Fortunately it is generally possible to make a reference which will be independent of the particular edition used by citing chapter and section numbers (for De Cive and De Homine, abbreviated DC and DH, respectively), or part, chapter and section numbers (for the Elements of Law, abbreviated EL). The Leviathan (abbreviated Lev) presents a problem, since the chapters are not divided into numbered sections. I have used as section numbers the paragraph numbers of the MacPherson edition (Penguin, 1968), which is probably the most satisfactory edition for students. Students will find the relevant portions of DH and all of DC translated in Man and Citizen, ed. by Bernard Gert, Humanities / Harvester, 1978. For EL I use the edition by F. Tönnies, Frank Cass, 1969.

It is unclear, both in the case of Descartes and in the case of Hobbes, how much of their work Spinoza knew. For Descartes I assume that Spinoza was familiar with everything which had been published by, say, 1670, which would include everything which seems most important (e.g., the Meditations, the Principles, the Passions of the Soul, and the letters included in Clercselier’s edition of the correspondence. I think it highly likely that Spinoza also knew the Regulae in a ms. version (Glazemaker, who translated much of Spinoza’s own work into Dutch, published a Dutch translation of the Regulae in 1684, so we know that a ms. was circulating in the circle of Spinoza’s friends). It seems less likely, but not impossible,
that he also knew the *Conversation with Burman*. As for Hobbes, I assume that Spinoza knew everything which had been published in a language he could read by 1670. That would include, in addition to *De Cive*, *De Corpore*, *De Homine*, and the *Leviathan*, but not the *Elements of Law*.

Other works cited in shortened form are:


Donagan = Alan Donagan, "Spinoza's Dualism," in Kennington.
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