



INTRODUCTION

A. SCHEDULE OF THE COLLECTION.

§ 1. The complete schedule of the Collection is as follows:

(i) *LETTERS.*

<i>Descartes:</i>	to Huygens	63
	to Van Surck	2
	to Bannius	1
		—66
<i>Huygens:</i>	to Descartes	46
<i>Van Surck:</i>	to Huygens	3
<i>Mersenne:</i>	to Descartes	1
		—116

(ii) *DOCUMENTS.*

(1) Manuscript.

<i>Descartes:</i>	Copy of Utrecht decree	1
	Copy of Groningen decrees	1
		—2
<i>Huygens:</i>	Draft of Compromise	1
<i>Van Surck:</i>	Draft of Compromise	1
<i>Stamptioen:</i>	The Three Points	1
	Draft of Compromise	1
		—2
<i>Notary:</i>	Deposition	1
<i>Joaachim Descartes:</i>	Receipt for monies	1
		—8

(2) Printed.

<i>Descartes:</i>	Placard	1
	Portrait	1
		—2
	Total	126

Before this Collection was discovered, about ninety-five autographs of Descartes were known. Of these, the large collections are at Leiden (20) and Paris (*Bibl. nat.*, 18 ;

INTRODUCTION

Institut, 16; *Sorbonne*, 18).¹ It is clear then that, so far as concerns the autographs of Descartes alone,² Mr. Buxton's Collection is equal in number to two-thirds of the total of those existing elsewhere, and is in itself more than three times as large as any other single assemblage; and we may add that it is unique not only in size but also in completeness, since in the Huygens series we have the other and complementary side of what forms one correspondence.

§ 2. Of the 126 letters and documents contained in the new Collection the large majority are here published for the first time. The exceptions are:

Fourteen of the letters of Descartes to Huygens (V, XXIV, XXVII, XXXII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVIII, XLIII, LVI, LVIII, LXXXVII, LXXX, LXXXI, LXXXIII), all published from copies by the first editor of Descartes' correspondence, Clerselier;

Seventeen of the letters of Huygens to Descartes (II, III, IX, XV, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXVII, XLI, XLII, XLIX, LVII, LXIV, LXXII, LXXXIV, XCV, C), all from copies found among the Huygens manuscripts at Amsterdam, first published by M. Adam in a communication to the *Revue bourguignonne de l'Enseignement supérieur* for 1895³;

Three of the documents, two of which (CXXIII and CXXIV) have been published before in their entirety, one (CXXV) in an abbreviated form.

Taking no account of the portrait (CXXVI), we have then in the Collection fifty-two letters of Descartes, twenty-nine of Huygens, three of Van Surck, one of Mersenne, and six documents, in all ninety-one letters and documents, hitherto unknown and entirely new.

¹ For the figures see M. Adam's Introduction to his monumental edition of the works of Descartes, vol. I, pp. lxxviii-lxx.

² Huygens' autographs are neither so rare nor so important.

³ See the Bibliography below, p. lxxv.

SCHEDULE OF THE COLLECTION

It is perhaps worth while to add that for students of Descartes' character it is of the utmost importance to possess and study the originals of his letters, even when the text was published, either from copies or from Descartes' own minutes, by Clerselier. A comparison of the original and published texts (and in the edition which follows the greatest care has been taken to make a complete collation in all cases when we have both), shows that Clerselier's alterations were not made in the interests of grammar alone, or arose simply, as he would have us believe,¹ from the confusion in which he found Descartes' papers. It would appear probable indeed, even from the few examples to be found in this one Correspondence,² that much of the tergiversation and temporizing which characterize the Descartes of the biographers is due to Clerselier's mistaken conceptions of the functions of an editor.³

§ 3. The Collection as it stands is not quite complete in itself, as there are in it a few obvious gaps. Fortunately, other autographs preserved in the various libraries of Europe and published in M. Adam's great edition of Descartes' correspondence, serve to complete it, and these are reprinted in the present volume. In order, however, to differentiate them from the material contained in the new Collection, they have been printed in a smaller type and have been distinguished by a supplementary number (IIa, VIIa, XXXa, LXa, LXb, LXXVIIa, LXXXXVa, and Ca).⁴

§ 4. In addition to these autographs which are essential to the completion of the series,⁵ there are certain letters

¹ Preface to the first volume of his edition of the letters.

² See the textual notes to e.g. XLIII, p. 95, l. 36; LVI, p. 136, l. 51; LXXXVII, p. 182, l. 42 and p. 183, l. 53; and LXXX, p. 187, ll. 5-7.

³ The suspicion was already voiced by Baillet (*Vie de Mr Descartes*, vol. II, p. 402, marginal note), himself not above suspicion.

⁴ The significance of the existence of these letters, forming part of, yet detached from, Mr. Buxton's Collection, is discussed later (below, pp. xlix ff.).

⁵ I have added XXXVIIIa for the sake of completeness, though by no

INTRODUCTION

published by Clerselier without the name of an addressee which M. Adam has suggested were addressed to Huygens. Of these, eight in all, there are three, viz. XXXIIa, XLIIa, and Ca,¹ which appear likely or certain, in view of later knowledge, to have been so addressed, or which at any rate throw some light upon the matters discussed in the Correspondence. These have been reprinted in their proper chronological place, also in smaller type and distinguished by supplementary numbers.

§ 5. There will be found then in the present volume every letter known or suspected to have passed between Descartes and Constantijn Huygens during the period 1635-1648. It must be remembered, however, that during all this time the two friends took such opportunities to see one another as were allowed by the retiring habits of the one and the heavy strain of official business upon the other. But apart from breaks in correspondence due to a more intimate communication,² the letters offer a complete and uninterrupted reflection of Descartes' immediate interests during the most productive period of his life.

§ 6. One last point remains to be noticed. It is perfectly natural to suppose that in the letter of May 6th, 1635 we

means persuaded that it was addressed to Huygens. (See the *prolegomena*, *ad loc.*, below, p. 86.)

¹ For the five others see below, XXVI, p. 50, l. 12 n.; p. 98, ll. 29-34; and pp. 238 and 247, foot-notes.

² See e.g. LL, p. 178, l. 21 n. and LXXV, p. 178, ll. 19-20 (cf. CIV, p. 249, ll. 13-14; CV, p. 250, ll. 2-4). For points that arose in conversation see CIII, p. 247, l. 2 (Bannius' music), and CVII, p. 254, l. 2 f. (Pascal's theory of the vacuum).

We have also to take into account verbal messages or news sent or received through friends, e.g. Reneri (below, XXVI, p. 50, l. 24; XXXVIII, p. 84, l. 75 and p. 85 l. 81 ff.); Golius (XVII, p. 34, l. 20); Schooten (XXX, p. 55, l. 5 f.); Van Surck (XCII, p. 227, l. 40); and even the correspondence of the distant Mersenne (LXVI, p. 159, l. 5 f.; LXVII, p. 161, l. 5 f.). All this is apart from the breaks due to Huygens' constant absences on official business and Descartes' journeys to France.

SCHEDULE OF THE COLLECTION

have the very first of those which passed between Descartes and Huygens, and the tone of the writing of both correspondents¹ suggests that they had not written to one another before. The meeting in the spring of 1635, however, was not their first,² and as a matter of fact after what was their first meeting, in April 1632, we find De Wilhem writing to Huygens and enclosing a letter from Descartes. Was this a letter addressed to Huygens and only sent on by De Wilhem? If so, the correspondence between the two friends began fully three years before the first letter which has survived. It seems, however, clear that the reference is to the letter of Descartes to De Wilhem himself in which he gives expression to the honour in which he holds Huygens,³ and which De Wilhem, anxious for an excuse to write to Huygens (he became his brother-in-law only in the following year), was only too glad to send for his perusal.

A similar problem exists with regard to the conclusion of our correspondence. The last letter we possess is that of Descartes to Huygens of December 27th, 1647. That winter Descartes looked upon as the most peaceful, i.e. the most retired and studious, time of his life.⁴ He passed through the Hague on January 14th, 1648, on his way back from accompanying his friend Picot to Rotterdam,⁵ and may then have seen Huygens personally; but he was in haste to continue his 'resueries' in his retreat at Egmond and had little

¹ 'Le pars en ce mesme rauissement de voz perfections où vous me laissastes à Amsteldam, et j'en porteray l'impression par tout', writes Huygens (below, I, p. 1, ll. 12-14); and Descartes replies: 'Trois matinées que j'ay eu l'honneur de conuerfer avec vous m'ont laissé telle impression de l'excellence de vostre esprit et de la solidité de vos iugemens, que . . . ie ne sçache perfonne au reste du monde à qui ie me fie tant qu'à vous . . .' (IIa, p. 5, ll. 12-16).

² See below, p. lxix.

³ The relevant passage is printed below, p. lxxi.

⁴ See *Corresp.* DIII, *Œuvres de Descartes* (ed. Adam), vol. V, p. 112, l. 26 f.

⁵ See *Corresp.* DVII, vol. V, p. 123, l. 2 f.

INTRODUCTION

time to spare for visits. Later in this year he journeyed again to France, and in the following year made the voyage to Sweden, never to return. Throughout all this period his correspondence with his other friends is very meagre, and he may well have received news of Huygens, as Huygens did of him, through friends.¹ But a postscript in a letter of Huygens to Mersenne early in 1648 suggests that the correspondence did as a fact continue after December 1647, the date of our last letter. 'Haftez vous de nous produire vostre phisque de vacuo', he writes on January 13th, 1648, 'mais, cependant voyez ce que m'en mande M. Descartes.'² Now there is no doubt that Huygens must have sent to Mersenne with this letter the original or a copy of a letter of Descartes, and as Descartes was making biting comments at the time directly to Mersenne on 'vos chercheurs de vuide',³ it is certainly possible that he wrote in similar terms to Huygens. On December 8th, 1647, however, Descartes had written to Huygens in depreciation of Pascal and his promised book on the vacuum,⁴ and there seems little doubt that it was an extract from this letter that Huygens sent to Mersenne in the following month.

It follows, therefore, that, in spite of appearances to the contrary, we have good reason to believe that in the Collection now published we have the whole extent of the correspondence which passed between Descartes and Huygens, beginning in May, 1635 and ending in December, 1647.

¹ 'Je ne vous importune gueres de mes lettres', Huygens wrote already in February 1646. 'Il me fuffit de vous scauoir en fanté et en estude, et j'ay mes espions autour de vous, pour en auoir d'affez seures nouvelles' (below, CI, p. 245, ll. 14-17).

² *Briefwisseling Huygens* (ed. Worp), no. 4735, vol. IV, p. 448.

³ *Corresp.* DIV, vol. V, p. 116, l. 18, of 31 January 1648.

⁴ Below, CVIII, p. 256, l. 6 f.

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

B. HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION.

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

The documents from which the history of the Correspondence may be reconstructed are the following:

- (a) *A Catalogue of a sale at Sotheby's* (Monday, May 30th, 1825).
- (b) A wrapper from the Sotheby sale.
- (c) *A Catalogue of Autograph Correspondence* (1833), issued by Thomas Thorpe, a bookseller of Covent Garden.

(a) *The Sotheby Catalogue.*

§ 1. Lots 125 and 126 of the Sotheby Catalogue¹ read as follows:

'Lot 125. A very curious assemblage of letters in French, forty-six in number, from M. Constantine Huygens, Sieur de Zuylichem, to the celebrated Des Cartes, between the years 1635 and 1647; with one letter to M. Van Hogelande.

'The envelope containing these has the following title in M. de Zuylichem's handwriting; "Lettres que j'ay escrites à Mons. Des Cartes des l'an 1635, jusques à 1647, inclus. restituées apres sa mort par M. de Hogelande, 21 Juillet, 1650."

(*MS. note in copy preserved in the British Museum:* 'Thorpe £12 12s'.)

'Lot 126. A similar Assemblage, partly bound together (but without covers) and partly loose; being the Letters of M. René Des Cartes to M. Constantine Huygens between 1635 and 1649.

'The letters are sixty-seven in number, and with the exception of one or two, are entirely in French. They relate either to transactions between the parties, Des Cartes' works, or mathematical subjects: a few are accompanied by diagrams. In one letter, of

¹ It is dated May 30th, but the sale seems to have been postponed till June 20th.

INTRODUCTION

1641, Des Cartes gives a list of the typographical errors in his *Meditationes de Prima Philosophia*. Interspersed are a few letters and other papers connected with the Correspondence, more particularly from Mons. A. van Surck, Amst. 19 Nov. 1639, Leyd. 30 Nov. 1639, and Leyd. 21 Dec. 1639; with a printed sheet entitled: *Antwoordt van den Wel-Eedelen Heer etc., Vyt de Fransche tale overgeset.*

(MS. note: 'Thorpe f. 23 2r.')

The letters contained in these two lots are clearly those forming the Descartes-Huygens Correspondence now published. Leaving the details of the Sotheby Catalogue for later discussion (and they present some interesting questions), we must ask how these letters came to be sold at Sotheby's at all.

§ 2. *The Sypestein Sale.* The Sotheby Catalogue is prefaced by the statement that 'the collection of Manuscripts here offered to the public is the entire property of a Gentleman of the highest consideration in Holland, by whose family they have been accumulated and preserved'. The collection was one well known to bibliographers as the Sypestein collection and the gentleman whose 'entire property' it was, was Jonkheer C. A. van Sypestein of Haarlem. The collection was very large, as the catalogue shows, and had been supplemented for nearly two centuries. No documents seem to have survived, however, giving the details of acquisition, and it is therefore now impossible to determine the date at which any particular portion was added.¹ However, we at least know definitely that the Descartes-

¹ Lot 124 is described as 'a paper entitled "Copie de la main de M. Des Cartes de mes Repliques sur une lettre de M. Saumaïse à M. Rivet touchant l'épigramme qui l'enfuit" in M. de Zuylichem's hand' (MS. note: 'Thorpe f. 1').

This paper, now preserved in the Royal Library at the Hague, is published below, Appendix H (a), pp. 310-33.

² See further below, pp. lviii-lxii.

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

Huygens Correspondence was a part of the Sypestein collection previous to 1825.

§ 3. *Van Hoghelande and Descartes' papers.* The other date fixed by the indications of the Sotheby Catalogue is 1650, when, according to the title in Huygens' hand then existing (it is unfortunately now lost), the letters written by Huygens to Descartes were returned to him by Van Hoghelande after Descartes' death. Luckily, we know exactly how Van Hoghelande came to be concerned in the disposal of Descartes' papers. When Descartes left for Sweden in 1649, he deposited a box with Van Hoghelande, leaving the papers which it contained, with certain stated exceptions, to his entire discretion. This box was opened in the presence of witnesses after Descartes' death early in 1650. We can only suppose that among the letters found in it were those received from Huygens, and that Van Hoghelande used the discretion allowed him by Descartes to return them to the writer.

Our information on this matter is derived from Baillet, who refers to the box deposited with Van Hoghelande in two principal passages in the *Life*. The first is when he is speaking of Descartes' preparations for his journey to Sweden in the summer of 1649:

'Il disposa deux coffres de ses hardes & de ses papiers pour la Suède; et du reste il fit une male, qu'il envoya en dépôt à Leyde chez M. de Hooghelande avec une lettre du 30 d'Août, pour le prier de faire ouvrir la male en sa présence & en celle de M. de Berghen, aux premières nouvelles certaines qu'il recevrait de sa mort' (Lettr. Ms. du 30. Août à Van-Hooghelande).¹

The second is in his account of the events following upon Descartes' death in February 1650:

'Le quatrième de Mars suivant l'on fit aussi l'Inventaire de tout ce que M. Descartes avoit laissé en Hollande avant son

¹ *Vie de M. Descartes*, vol. II, p. 386.

INTRODUCTION

départ pour la Suède. Le tout consistoit en une malle, qu'il avoit mise en dépôt à Leyde chez son ami M. de Hooghelande Gentilhomme Catholique. La malle fut ouverte à la réquisition de M. Van-Sureck Seigneur de Berghen créancier du défunt, par devant un Notaire public pour la Cour provinciale de Hollande nommé François Doude admis sur la nomination des Magistrats de la ville de Leyde, en présence de M. de Hooghelande & de trois témoins, qui étoient M. de la Voyette Gentilhomme François; M. Schooten Professeur des Mathématiques dans l'Université, & M. de Raey Docteur en Médecine & en Philosophie. . . Il se rencontra . . . parmi divers livres & papiers, quelques écrits, & quelques lettres de M. Descartes ramassées en un paquet.¹

§ 4. *Baillet's search for the contents of the box.* Baillet had of course a pressing interest in the papers contained in the box. He had evidently known or suspected that they were still extant at the time when he was assembling his materials, and most conscientiously had caused inquiries to be made about them in Holland from the person most likely to possess the requisite information, the M. de Raey who was present when the box was opened. Unfortunately for the biography from which almost all of our information concerning Descartes is drawn, Baillet met with a distinct rebuff. The actual story is told in the Preface to the Life:

'A dire vray, il semble que c'étoit principalement de la Hollande qu'on devoit attendre les plus grands secours pour ce dessein. Vingt et un ans de séjour y avoient fait la partie la plus importante de la vie de M. Descartes, & il conçoit presque pour rien tout le tems qu'il avoit passé ailleurs. Cette considération avoit fait rechercher ce qui pouvoit rester d'amis ou de disciples de M. Descartes dans ces Provinces: & l'on n'a point crû pouvoir

¹ Mynheer de Waard very kindly searched in the Leiden archives for the deed which would probably have been drawn up on this occasion, but unfortunately without result.

² *Vie de M. Descartes*, vol. II, pp. 428-9.
xxxviii

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

mieux l'adresser qu'au sçavant M. de Raey qui vit encore maintenant à Amsterdam, & qui fait toujours beaucoup d'honneur à son pais & à sa profession. L'attachement qu'il a toujours fait paroître pour la doctrine de M. Descartes, & les habitudes particulières qu'il avoit eues avec luy & avec la plupart de ses amis de Hollande sembloient nous promettre toutes choses de son honnêteté. Il s'étoit trouvé présent à l'inventaire qui s'étoit fait à Leyde trois semaines après la mort de M. Descartes d'un coffre qu'il avoit laissé chez M. de Hooghelande, avec M. de la Voyette Gentilhomme François, M. de Sureck Seigneur de Berghe, & M. de Schooten le père, tous amis de notre Philosophe. M. de Raey reste aujourd'huy le seul de ceux qui auroient pu dire des nouvelles d'un paquet de papiers & de lettres qui se trouverent dans ce coffre. On l'avoit donc fait prier tres-respectueusement de vouloir donner sur cela & sur ce qu'il pouvoit sçavoir d'ailleurs des éclairciffemens pour l'histoire de M. Descartes. . . M. de Raey a eu la bonté de répondre sur le premier chef que les papiers qui s'étoient trouvez dans le coffre étoient en très petit nombre & de peu d'importance. . . | Pour le second chef . . . il a consulté M. le Bourg-maître Hudde autre Cartésien de grande distinction, & après avoir mûrement considéré ce qu'on étoit capable de faire en France, ils ont été d'avis de ne se mêler en aucune maniere dans cette description de la vie de M. Descartes, & de n'y contribuer aucune chose. M. de Raey a dit en particulier à M. Van-Limborch VITA CARTESII RES EST SIMPLICISSIMA, ET GALLI EAM CORRUMPERENT.¹

The reason for M. de Raey's bitterness it is now impossible to trace. He had been a pupil of Regius in the days when Regius was an ardent Cartesian, and had sustained on his behalf Cartesian theses in 1641.² He had privately taught Cartesian principles in medicine,³ and in a *Clavis philosophiae naturalis*⁴ endeavoured to reconcile Descartes with Aristotle. He had also been the primary

¹ *Vie de M. Descartes*, Préf., pp. xxvii-xxx.

² Baillet, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 140.

³ *Ib.*, vol. II, p. 320, marginal note.

⁴ Leiden, 1654.



INTRODUCTION

source, although inadvertently,¹ of the earliest account of Descartes' life, Lipstorp's *Specimina Philosophiae Cartesianae* (Lübeck, 1653). Whatever the reason for M. de Raey's spleen, we owe to it that Baillet is constrained to quote the actual text of Descartes' letter to Van Hoghelande relating to the papers left in the box.

Cela est très-conforme à ce que M. Descartes écrivit à M. de Hooghelande, lorsqu'il mit le coffre en dépôt chez luy :

« Le ne sçache point, dit-il, 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, ie
« crois que le plus sûr est de les brûler toutes, excepté celles de
« Voetius au Père Merfenne que vous trouuerez insérées dans le
« couuercle du coffre, & que ie desire estre gardées pour seruir de
« préseruatif contre ses calomnies. Vous pourrez aussi lire toutes
« les autres, ou les laisser lire par quelques amis discrets auant que
« de les brûler. Et même ne brûler que celles que vous voudrez, car
« ie remets entièrement cela à vostre discretion. »²

Baillet adds maliciously: « M. de Raey pourroit bien auoir
« été cet ami discret à qui M. de Hooghelande auroit fait
« lire ces lettres auant que de les brûler: & si elles n'ont
« pas été brûlées, il n'y a peut-être eu que la crainte de les
« rendre utiles au Public qui luy en a fait faire un
« mystère. . . » Now there is no doubt that Huygens was
a confidential friend of both Descartes and Van Hoghelande,
and that he, rather than De Raey, would have been asked
for advice concerning the disposal of the letters found in
the box. Be that as it may, the following points of interest
for the immediate subject of inquiry suggest themselves
from the documents preserved by Baillet:

¹ Baillet, *op. cit.*, Préf., pp. xiii-xv.

² i. e. M. de Raey's reply that they were 'very few and of small importance'.

³ *Ib.*, pp. xxviii-xxix.

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

That portion of the Descartes-Huygens Correspondence which comprises the letters sent by Huygens to Descartes may reasonably be supposed to have been among those deposited with Van Hoghelande by Descartes before his departure for Sweden in August 1649, and seen by Van Hoghelande and other witnesses in March 1650. Since, for the other portion of the Correspondence, that comprising the letters of Descartes to Huygens, we have the positive affirmation from Huygens himself that nothing which he received from Descartes was destroyed,¹ we can be sure that the two series sold at Sotheby's in 1825, and at present in our possession, were in the possession of Constantijn Huygens on the day when the letters which he had written to Descartes were returned to him by Van Hoghelande; namely (according to the title in his own hand still extant at the time of the Sotheby sale), on July 21st, 1650.

Having seen the information regarding the history of the Correspondence derived from the Sotheby Catalogue, we may now turn to the statements which it makes concerning its contents.

§ 5. (i) *The Numbers.* Lot 125, comprising the series from Huygens to Descartes, is described as containing forty-six letters. The number of the Huygens letters still preserved is exactly forty-six. The 'one letter to Van Hoghelande' included in the forty-six is that printed as CVII. It is addressed to Van Hoghelande 'to be forwarded to Descartes', an additional instruction which probably missed the eye of the cataloguer because it is in the Dutch language and

¹ 'Le n'entens pas sans ressentiment d'injure le doute que vous semblez auoir, si les papiers dont il vous a pleu me gratifier autrefois ont été conferuez ou non. Il partiroit bien moins de chose de vostre main, et ne se perdroit jamais dans la mienne' (Huygens to Descartes, 15 June 1636, below, IX, p. 21, ll. 1-5). So in June 1643 he speaks of 'le soin et reuerence que je desire à tout petit papier de vostre main' (below, LXXXIV, p. 203, ll. 14-15).

INTRODUCTION

in a very small hand. The reason why he noticed the letter especially was because it happens to be the last of the Huygens series, so that its superscription, being on the reverse of the second sheet of the letter, is on the concluding page of the whole.

Lot 126, comprising the series from Descartes to Huygens, is described as being composed of sixty-seven letters. Now apart from those accounted for by Lot 125, the present collection is composed of eighty letters and documents. Of these, three, the signature of Joachim Descartes (CX), the portrait of Descartes (CXXVI), and one letter of Descartes to Huygens (XXIX), we know to have been separate acquisitions.¹ Of the remaining seventy-seven, sixty-nine are letters (sixty-two from Descartes to Huygens, two [CXIII, CXV] from Descartes to Van Surck, one [CXXII] from Descartes to Bannius, three [CXII, CXIV, CXVI] from Van Surck to Huygens, and one [CXI] from Mersenne to Descartes), and eight are documents (seven [CXVII-CXXI, CXXIII, and CXXV] manuscript, the two last being in the hand of Descartes, and one [CXXIV] printed). The number sixty-seven, therefore, is difficult to understand.

The key to the puzzle lies in the words: 'with the exception of one or two are entirely in French'. From this statement it is clear that the number is not meant to include all the 'interspersed letters and other papers', because most of the 'other papers' at least are not in French at all. The difficulty may be resolved on the supposition that the cataloguer adopted the easy and obvious course of adding together the number of all the papers written in Descartes' own hand. Of these there are precisely sixty-seven, namely, the sixty-two letters from Descartes to Huygens, the two to Van Surck, and the one to Bannius (these last are without any distinctive super-

¹ See below, pp. xlv-xlvi, and the several *prolegomena*.

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

scription), and the two copies of documents in his own hand (CXXIII and CXXV). Of these it is only the one letter to Bannius and the copies of the decrees which are not 'entirely in French'.

§ 6. (ii) *The Dates*. The letters now surviving extend from 1635 to 1647, exactly in accordance with the information provided by the title once extant in Huygens' hand, information the more valuable in that Descartes died in 1650, and we might thus have expected the Correspondence to extend up to that year.

The point must be insisted on in view of the description of Lot 126, in which we have the definite statement that the letters of Descartes to Huygens covered the years 1635 to 1649 (sixteen hundred and forty-nine). In order to be able to accept this date we should have to suppose that all the letters of Descartes to Huygens for the years 1648-9 were signalled out for specific destruction after 1825; and that, so far as the replies are concerned, either Huygens did not send any, or else just those had been lost by Descartes before he deposited his box of papers with Van Hoghelande. It seems preferable, therefore, to regard the date 1649 as a misprint or mistake for 1647.¹

(b) *The Sotheby Wrapper*.

This interesting testimony to the proximate source of the Collection is a large double foolscap sheet of coarse paper. On the outside page we read the following:

D

Letters of M. René Des Cartes

Separate or make one lot as you think best but if not connected they will be better separated in several lots.

¹ The Catalogue is not remarkable for accuracy. Thus, no. 189 is listed as a letter of Reneri of 28 March 1649, just ten years after Reneri's death.

INTRODUCTION

LOT 126

62 Letters

Number 4 wanting

This book of Des Cartes' lett(ers)
to be separated carefully press(ed)
and great care taken of the ink.

From 'Separate' to 'wanting' is in pencil; the rest in ink. It is not all in one hand. Further, the words Lot 126 are scrawled across the page in larger writing than the rest, and underlie the last part of the sentence preceding.

§ 1. All these points are important for the following reason. Lot 126, when sold in 1825, was 'partly bound together . . . and partly loose'.¹ It follows that the last instruction now found on the wrapper certainly, and the first instruction probably, are posterior in date to the Sotheby sale. The possessor of the original sale wrapper would have been the purchaser at the sale, the bookseller Thorpe. It follows that it is to Thorpe that we must attribute the present condition of the letters. It is Thorpe who 'separated' the letters of Descartes to Huygens and formed them into one collection together with those of Huygens to Descartes; and further, since a separate 'title' for the Huygens series would now be unnecessary, it is Thorpe whom we must hold responsible for the loss of the precious document in Huygens' own hand giving testimony to the date when he recovered through Van Hoghelande the letters he had written to Descartes. The wrapper, then, when it left the auctioneer, did not bear all of what we now read upon it. The words Lot 126 underlie the last part of the sentence preceding (the preliminary instruction 'Separate or make one lot as you think best, &c.?), because it was already there when the instruction was written. That

¹ Cf. above, p. xxxv.
xiv

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

is to say, the purchaser made use of the original wrapper in order to write the necessary instructions for the guidance of his experts and assistants. The first instruction, being tentative only, is in pencil; the second, giving the final decision, is in ink.

§ 2. The other points in the wrapper may be briefly dismissed. The number 62 is curious, and can only refer to the sixty-two letters from Descartes to Huygens.¹ The letter 'D', clearly for Descartes, is the index-letter under which Thorpe intended to insert the whole of his new acquisition in his own next sale catalogue.² The words 'Number 4 wanting' present a difficult problem. In the Collection one loose sheet survives bearing the usual superscription in Descartes' hand to Huygens. In the right-hand top corner there is found the pencilled number 4, and beneath it, in what is evidently the same hand as the sentence on the wrapper, '4 is wanting'. Exactly what this pencilled number means, we shall have to ask later.³ So far, however, it is at least clear that the maker of the note on the Sotheby wrapper had reason to expect a letter which would have been letter 4, but had not found it, and noted it as missing on the wrapper.

(c) Thorpe's Catalogue.

Nos. 234 and 235 in the Catalogue of Autograph Correspondence issued by Thomas Thorpe, Bookseller, of 38 Bedford Street, Covent Garden, in 1833, are described as follows:

234. Des Cartes and Constantine Huygens, the celebrated mathematician, their correspondence, comprising One Hundred and Twenty-seven pieces, 1635-47, £8 8s.

235. Des Cartes, a long letter to M. Huygens relative to some correspondence between them, M. Van Surck, and M. de Charnacé;

¹ Above, p. xliii.

³ Below, pp. 1, ff.

² Cf. below, p. xlviii.

INTRODUCTION

expresses a difficulty in deciphering some matter 'de façon que le retardement meme et les restrictions que j'y remarque font que l'obligation que je vous ay en est d'autant plus grande', dated d'Alcmaer July 5th, 1637. Fine portrait, Jollain exculdit, 1670, 75. 6d.

The 'long letter' of no. 235 is that published below as no. XXIX, and the portrait that described on p. 309 (CXXVI). We are left then to consider the contents of no. 234.

The One hundred and twenty-seven pieces.

As we have it at present, the whole Collection amounts to one hundred and thirty-one pieces, excluding two single sheets which bear superscriptions only. Of these, two are accounted for by Thorpe's no. 235; one, the signature of Joachim Descartes (below, CX), from another catalogue of Thorpe's (*ib.*, *proleg.*). This leaves one hundred and twenty-eight, one more than the number given in the catalogue. This discrepancy may be explained in various ways. It may be supposed that the purchaser from Thorpe had the fortune to be able to add one to the Collection; it may indeed well be that Thorpe himself was able to supplement it before disposal. It would seem, however, more likely that the counting was slightly different. The number one hundred and thirty-one is arrived at by counting the Collection piece by piece. There are in all one hundred and twenty-six separate letters and documents, or, excluding the three which have a separate history, one hundred and twenty-three. Of these, one of Descartes' letters to Huygens (XCI), the letter to Bannius (CXXII), and the copy of the Groningen decrees (CXXV), are of two pieces each; and one of Descartes' letters to Huygens (LXXXI), of three pieces. Hence the one hundred and twenty-three letters and documents are in one hundred and twenty-eight pieces. One of these documents is the printed placard mentioned in the Sotheby catalogue (below, CXXIV), and

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

it is possible that this was not counted in Thorpe's enumeration. It is, however, more probable that the single sheet inserted in letter XCI was counted together with XCI as one piece. In any case it is clear that with the possible exception of one document or letter accruing later, the Correspondence now published is that which was offered for sale by Thorpe in 1833, and that it was made up from the two lots purchased by him at the Sotheby sale of 1825.

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

The evidence adduced so far is external, depending entirely on documents relating to the Collection. It is now time to turn to the Collection itself. It will be convenient to treat it for the moment as it was in 1825, i.e. as two separate series.

§ 1. (a) The *Huygens series* present two characteristics:

(1) No single one bears the marks of binding. In no case are there holes at the fold originating from the stitches of the sewing; and the paper of the two letters the edges of which are gilt (LVII and LIX) was without doubt in that condition when purchased.

(2) They all bear a small capital D in pencil in the right-hand top corner of the several sheets. This is probably the D of Descartes, the name, that is (of the recipient, not of the writer), under which the letters were classified in Thorpe's sale catalogue.

We may note further that the manuscripts are in an excellent state of preservation, and offer no signs of ever having been restored.

§ 2. (b) The *Descartes series* are in precisely the opposite state. Very few are perfect. The majority have been trimmed, some unfortunately with insufficient care; those left untouched (owing to the writing having come close to

INTRODUCTION

the edge of the paper) are very frayed and rubbed. Two points in their regard are of special interest.

(1) In every case signs of binding are clear.¹ This means that the 'partly bound together, but without covers, and partly loose' of the description of the Sotheby Catalogue must be understood to mean that the collection had originally all been sewed together into one 'book' (to use the word of the wrapper), but that at some time the sewing had broken and allowed some of the letters to become loose. The importance of this point will appear later.

(2) The second and more significant fact is that every one of the letters² contains a serial number in pencil in the right-hand top corner of the page. Since these numbers appear only on the Descartes, not on the Huygens, series, they date certainly from the time when the two were still independent. That is to say, they offer the order of the Descartes series while it was still all contained together in one 'book'.

¹ There is only one apparent exception, the letter printed as XL. This, however, was certainly sewed, although once only and that at the very top where now the signs of mending are seen. The very next letter, XLIII, presents another instance of this imperfect sewing, but in this case the marks of the stitching have not been concealed by the restorer.

² With the exception of VI, VIII, XIV, XXVI, XXIX, XLV, CXIII, and possibly XLIV (? = 26) and LXXXII (? = 58). It by no means follows, however, that these letters never bore their several numbers. The numbers may well have been cut away when the leaves were trimmed: in one case certainly (XXIII = 13) the figures which survive are clipped at the top; in another (XI = 7), only the bottom of the figure preserved on the extra sheet is now to be seen on the front page. Where the letters have not been trimmed the paper at the edges and corners is so rubbed and worn away that it is impossible now to determine exactly what may once have been there.

In any case the exceptions are so few as to justify the assumption that originally all the Descartes letters bore these numbers.

[For the sake of simplicity I omit all reference to a second and later hand in the pencilled numbers, repeating such of the original figures as had become faint.]

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

§ 3. The point would be without interest but for the curious fact that there are gaps in the numbers. Now gaps in the numbers can only indicate gaps in the series. But we know positively that we possess all the Descartes series sold at the Sotheby sale. There were gaps in the series, then, at the time of the sale. It follows necessarily that there existed an integral corpus of the letters of Descartes to Huygens before the time of the Sotheby sale. This corpus, which is none other than the 'book of Descartes' letters' mentioned on the Sotheby wrapper, not, however, as in 1825, 'partly bound and partly loose', but still intact and entire, can be reconstructed by a study of the pencilled numbers surviving.

A glance at the detailed lists given below¹ shows how our letters can be supposed to have been sewed together in this 'book'. All of them can be reasonably accounted for. The cases where the serial (pencilled) number has to be supplied are very few, and in them the dates fit exactly. Although, however, we can account for all the Descartes letters now in our possession, we cannot account for all the numbers. There are six gaps, namely 1, 4, 17, 49, 61, 80. It remains to see how these numbers were once filled, i. e. to reconstitute the original 'book' in its entirety.

§ 4. *The gaps in the numbers.* If we turn to M. Adam's edition of the correspondence of Descartes, we see that thirty-two letters are ascribed to his correspondence with Huygens. Of these, nine are autographs, in most cases lacking specific superscriptions, twenty-three are conjecturally identified from the text given, without the name of the addressee, by Clerselier. Of these last, sixteen are actually extant in the present Collection, and about them there is no doubt; at the same time they already have their specific numbers in the list, and

¹ pp. lv-lvii.

INTRODUCTION

therefore cannot be used to supply the gaps. There remain the nine autographs, and the seven identified from Clerselier's text, from which to choose. Of these some can now certainly be ascribed to other correspondents; some, although possibly written to Huygens, bear no relation whatever to the rest of the present Correspondence and may therefore be dismissed with a passing reference; some are what may be called neutral, since the matters to which they refer, although known to have been of interest to Huygens, may very well have been of interest to other members of the same circle. Of these, then, and they form the majority of the sixteen, no single one can be said positively to belong to the present series.

There are, however, a few, and they are all autographs, of which the contrary is true. These form so integral a part of our series that they can be separated from it only by force, and that because they are in specific reply to, or in continuation of, letters actually contained in it. These are six in number only, namely, those printed as II a, VII a, XXX a, LXXVII a, LXXXV a, and Ca. Now these are precisely the six which (with one exception, Ca [= 80], which is slightly out of place), in their exact order of date, correspond with the gaps in the pencilled numerical series.

§ 5. 'No. 4 is wanting.' We may here return to a point left over earlier.¹ We saw that on the Sotheby wrapper there are found the words 'no. 4 wanting', and that we have in the Collection one loose sheet bearing the usual superscription in Descartes' hand to Huygens, in the right-hand top corner of which is found the pencilled number '4', and beneath it, in what is evidently the same hand as the sentence on the wrapper, '4 is wanting'. How, we asked, did the writer know that 'no. 4' was wanting, and what and where was this 'no. 4'. We can now answer these

¹ Above, p. xlv.

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

questions. Thorpe found the loose superscription sheet marked 4 when he 'separated' the 'book', but no letter with that number. The reason why letter no. 4 was not there was, of course, because it had become detached from the Collection earlier; but at whatever time the loss was sustained, the superscription sheet was left behind in the 'book'. And that is why, in the Library at Leningrad where the missing letter finally found a refuge, it is without its superscription; 'l'adresse manque', remarks M. Adam in his description of the letter.¹ The superscription on its special sheet and bearing the number of the letter to which it belonged had remained in the book although the letter itself had become detached and lost.

Just as 'no. 4' slipped out of the Collection and is now in Leningrad,² so nos. 1³ and 80⁴ are now in Paris, no. 17⁵ in Leiden, no. 49⁶ in Philadelphia, while no. 61, after having been published in 1860, has again disappeared. The inference is unavoidable. In the pencilled numbers we have a testimony to the existence of an early and integral corpus of Descartes' letters to Huygens, a corpus already broken up, apparently by accident, long before the Sotheby sale. We saw that at that time the whole was 'partly bound and partly loose', loose, that is, from the

¹ *Corresp.* LXXVII, vol. I, p. 342, *proleg.*

² The trace of a pencilled 4 was discerned by two out of four palaeographers who kindly examined the letter.

³ Letter not now available for inspection.

⁴ Reading not quite clear, but a number is certainly there and is either 80 or 86.

⁵ No number visible.

⁶ The number is still clear, and was so read by the Curator in charge without any previous suggestion.

For the information given above I am indebted to M. Robert de Courcel, Dean J. H. Dunham of Temple University, Philadelphia, and the keepers of the manuscripts at the libraries of Leningrad and Leiden University. It may be added that nothing seems now to be known regarding the earlier history of any of these letters.

INTRODUCTION

binding; and that what had probably happened was that the sewing had broken and had allowed some of the contents of the 'book' to become detached from the rest. A last problem therefore remains. Who had the letters bound into a 'book'?

§ 6. *Huygens' books of letters.* The manuscripts of Constantijn Huygens reveal a meticulous accuracy. His writing is invariable. He seldom omitted even an accent, and never allowed himself the smallest licence in spelling. When a letter took any time to reach him, he made careful note of the date and place of receipt; when he received the packet of his own letters back from Van Hoghelande, he registered the detail of the occurrence in a special title in his own hand. Constantijn Huygens is precisely the man whom one would expect to have bound volumes made of the letters he had received from eminent friends. And so indeed he did:

'Sal mede hij, Constantijn, in zijne bewaering houden ende forgvuldigh opluijten,' he wrote in his will, dated the second of October, 1682, 'alle de *schriften* bij mij curieuselijck verfaemelt ende *ten deele* in *boecken* gebonden, *soo van groote, oft geleerde oft anderssins aensienlijcke perſoonen aen mij geschreven, oock insonderheijt die ick van mijne eighen handt in proſa ende carmine ende in verscheijden taelen kome naer te laeten . . .*'¹ Huygens himself then

¹ Cf. e.g. below, XXXVI, *proleg.*, p. 75 (cf. XXXVII, p. 79, l. 4); XLVI, p. 110, l. 84; LVI, *proleg.*, p. 134; LVIII, *proleg.*, p. 141; LXX, p. 170, l. 3, and LXXIII, *proleg.*, p. 175.

² Quoted from Schinkel, *Nadere Bijzonderheden betrekkelijk Constantijn Huygens*, 8c. (1851), p. 42, in *Briefwisseling Huygens*, Vol. I, *Introd.*, p. ix.

³ 'And he, Constantijn [the eldest son and heir], shall take charge of, and lock away carefully, all the *manuscripts* diligently collected by me and partly bound into books, both those written to me by eminent persons, whether learned or otherwise distinguished, and especially those which I myself shall leave behind in my own hand, in prose and poetry, and in different languages. . . .'

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

had his manuscripts bound into books, and among those which he put into the safe keeping of his eldest son Constantijn there are mentioned specifically those which he received from persons of distinction in the fields of learning. We have sufficient evidence of Huygens' regard for Descartes' to be sure that Descartes' letters would be among the very first to be collected and bound in such a way that their preservation would be assured. The facts then point in one direction only. The 'book of Descartes' letters' sold eventually at Sotheby's in 1825 was the book made up by Constantijn Huygens himself.

§ 7. The very fact that the Collection was made so early explains why it failed to see the light. The elder Huygens was an intimate friend and correspondent of Chanut, who first undertook the task of publishing Descartes' remains,¹ and without doubt gave him the copies of such of the letters written to him by Descartes as afterwards appeared in Clerselier's edition.² A study of these, however, shows that they were chiefly those dealing with mathematical or scientific topics.³ By the time the detail of the personal

¹ Above, p. xli, n.

² See Clerselier's dedicatory letter to Chanut prefaced to the second edition (1663) of volume I of the letters.

³ In this connexion Huygens' letter of 31 December 1653 to the Princess Elisabeth is of great importance. 'M. Chanut qui possède tous les papiers du défunct et prétend d'en faire imprimer quelques lettres d'élite', he writes (*Briefwisseling*, 5323, vol. V, p. 194), 'désire feuilleter le tout aveq' mondit Archimède' [i.e. his second son Christiaan, the mathematician], 'pour veoir ce qu'il y a encor de philosophique ou de mathématique dont on pourroit faire part au public . . .'

This passage seems to suggest that Huygens had already furnished Chanut with copies of those of Descartes' letters he himself possessed which he considered desirable for publication.

⁴ Viz. V, XXXII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVIII, XLIII, LVI, LVIII, LXXVII, LXXX, LXXXI, LXXXIII. The exceptions are the letter of condolence on the death of Mme. Huygens (XXIV) and the complimentary letter to the reigning house of Holland (XXVII). For at least one letter

INTRODUCTION

history of Descartes became of interest to the learned world, the close tie which had existed between him and Constantijn Huygens was forgotten, at least in France.¹ Baillet shows the completest ignorance on the subject. His references to Constantijn Huygens are always confused² and are evidently derived from Descartes' published correspondence. He did not know his writing, and even failed to distinguish him from his son Christiaan³; and although this son, a man of European reputation who had lived in France for nearly twenty years up to 1681, was still alive, and even Constantijn Huygens himself had only just died (1687), among the long list of names of friends of Descartes from or concerning whom he had inquiries made for the purposes of the forthcoming biography,⁴ we look in vain for the name of Huygens. We can only suppose then that our book of Descartes' letters, after a few copies had been made from it about 1653, remained untouched among Constantijn Huygens' other manuscripts.

Before following it in its subsequent peregrinations until it crossed the seas to be sold at Sotheby's in 1825, it may be opportune to examine it as it then was.

which Baillet saw in copy, but which had not been published by Clerselier—it is quoted as *Lettre. 11. MS. de Desc.*—see below, CVI, p. 251, l. 2 n.

¹ Their common and principal correspondent, Mersenne, had predeceased both in 1648.

² See Christiaan Huygens' remarks on Baillet *ap. Cousin, Fragments philosophiques*, ed. 3, vol. II, p. 155 f.

³ The 'ms. letters of Christiaan Huygens' cited by Baillet (vol. II, pp. 157, 248, 292, 297, and 380) are all from the correspondence of Constantijn. Cf. below, LXVIII, p. 167, l. 11 n.; CVII, p. 255, l. 11 n.

⁴ *Pref.*, pp. xxii–xxviii.

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

III. HUYGENS' MANUSCRIPT BOOK OF DESCARTES' LETTERS.

Huygens' book of Descartes' letters may be tentatively reconstructed as follows:

(Col. I gives the serial numbers from 1 to 85. When without brackets they are actually found in pencil on the letters of columns II and IV. When in brackets they are supplied conjecturally.)

Col. II gives the letters in the Collection on which the figures are found, quoted by the numbers under which they are published in the present volume. When prefaced by a query the ascription is conjectural.

Col. III calls further attention to the conjectural ascriptions; and describes the manuscript when not a letter from Descartes to Huygens.

Col. IV gives the letters not in our Collection now, but which once formed part of it.

Col. V gives the date of the letters, thus showing their chronological sequence.

Col. VI gives the provenance of the letters noted in Col. IV which no longer form part of our Collection.)

[1]	?	II a	1 Nov. 35	Paris, <i>Coll. Foucher de Careil.</i>
2	V			1/11 Dec. 35 ¹	
3	IV			8 Dec. 35	
4	VII a (super-		VII a	undated	Leningrad Library
	scription			[31 Mar. 36]	(without super-
	sheet only)				scription sheet).
[5]	? VI	[no number visible]		28 Mar. 36	
[6]	? VIII	[no number visible]		11 June 36	
7	XI			13 July 36	
8	XIII			30 Oct. 36	
[9]	? XIV	[no number visible]		1 Jan. 37	
10	XVII			27 Feb. 37	
11	XX			22 Mar. 37	
12	XXII			29 Mar. 37	
13	XXIII			20 Apr. 37	
14	XXIV			20 May 37	
15	XXVII			12 June 37	
[16]	? XXIX	[no number visible]		5 July 37	[Huy. ²
[17]		? XXX a	5 Oct. 37	Leiden Univ., <i>Coll.</i>

¹ Probably put in the wrong order because of the deceptive double date.
² Descartes' autograph of the appended *Traité de la Mécanique* was in Christiaan Huygens' hands in 1693 (notes on Baillet, *ap. Cousin, op. cit.*, p. 157) and was left by him to the Leiden University Library; but the letter itself may well have remained in his father's collection.



INTRODUCTION

18	XXXII	4 Dec. 37
19	XXXIV	8 Feb. 38
20	XXXV	9 Mar. 38
21	XXXVI	June 38
22	XXXVIII	19 Aug. 38
23	XXXIX	29 Jan. 39
24	XL	6 May 39
25	XLIII	6 June 39
26	XLIV	17 Nov. 39
27	CXII	[number hardly visible] [Van Surck to Huygens]
28	CXVII	[The Deposition]
29	CXVIII	[Stamptioen's Three Points]
[30]	? CXIII	[Descartes to Van Surck; no number visible]
[31]	? XLV	[no number visible]
32	CXIX	[Huygens' draft]
33	CXV	[Descartes to Van Surck]
34	CXIV	[Van Surck to Huygens]
35	XLVI	30 Nov. 39
36	XLVIII	12 Dec. 39
37	L	17 Dec. 39
38	LIII	3 Jan. 40
39	LVI	12 Mar. 40
40	LVIII	31 July 40
41	CXVI	27 Aug. 40
42	CXXI	[Van Surck to Huygens] [Van Surck's draft]
43	CXX	[Stamptioen's draft]
44	LXII	undated
45	LXVIII	[Dec. 39] undated [26 Apr. 42]
46	LXIII	Apr. 41
47	LXV	29 July 41
48	LXVI	22 Jan. 42
49	LXIX	31 Jan. 42
50	LXXI	26 Apr. 42
51	LXXII	4 May 42
52	LXXIII	1 Sept. 42
53	LXXV	5 Oct. 42
54	LXXVII	10 Oct. 42
55	LXXVIII	5 Jan. 43
56	LXXX	14 Jan. 43
57	LXXXI	18 Feb. 43
58	LXXXII	22 May 43
		[number hardly visible]

[F. J. Dreer.
Philadelphia, Coll.]

HISTORY OF THE COLLECTION

59	LXXXIII	24 May 43
60	LXXXV	[accompanied by CXXIII and CXXIV]
[61]		?LXXXVa 26 June 43
62	LXXXVI	10 July 43
63	LXXXVIII	20 Sept. 43
64	LXXXIX	17 Oct. 43
65	XCI	2 Nov. 43
66	XCVI	15 Nov. 43
67	XCIV	13 Nov. 44
68	XCVII	26 Feb. 44
69	XCIX	21 Dec. 44
70-3	CXXV	[Groningen decrees] 17 Feb. 45
74	CII	May 45
75	CV	11 Mar. 46
76-7	CVI	4 Feb. 47
78	CVIII	12 May 47
79	CIX	8 Dec. 47
80		27 Dec. 47
81	{ CIII	4 Aug. 45
82	{ CXXI	30 Nov. 46
[83]	{ XXXVI	[Descartes to Bannius] undated [1640]
		[No number visible] undated
84	{ XIX	[June 37] undated
85	{ CXI	[Mersenne to Descartes] [3 Mar. 37]
		15 Feb. 37

Autograph now lost.

[de Courcel.
Paris, Coll. Georges]

Several points of interest may be noted in respect of this book (and it should be emphasized that conjecture has been admitted in the reconstruction only to a very slight degree):

(1) it requires the inclusion of all the autograph letters which were demanded by other considerations¹ (IIa, VIIa, XXXa, LXVIIa, LXXXVa, and Ca), with the exception of LXa, LXb. The loss of these from Huygens' book may very well be due to the special press of business in which Huygens found himself at the time of receipt.²

(2) it does not admit certain letters the inclusion of which was denied on other considerations.³

¹ See above, *Introd.*, A, § 3, p. xxxi.

² Below, LXb, p. 148, l. 23 n.

³ References in *Introd.*, A, § 4, p. xxxii, n. 1. It leaves no room, however, lvii