

Leibniz, Bayle and the Controversy on Sudden Change

Markku Roinila

(In: Giovanni Scarafile & Leah Gruenpeter Gold (ed.), *Paradoxes of Conflicts*, Springer 2016)

Leibniz's metaphysical views were not known to most of his correspondents, let alone to the larger public, until 1695 when he published an article in *Journal des savants*, titled in English "A New System of the Nature and Communication of Substances, and of the Union of the Soul and Body" (henceforth New System).¹ The article raised quite a stir. Perhaps the most interesting and cunning critique of Leibniz's views was provided by a French refugee in Rotterdam, Pierre Bayle (1647–1706) who is most famous for his *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (1697). The fascinating controversy on Leibniz's idea of pre-established harmony and a number of other topics lasted for five years and ended only when Bayle died. In this paper I will give an overview of the communication, discuss in detail a central topic concerning spontaneity or a sudden change in the soul, and compare the views presented in the communication to Leibniz's reflections in his partly concurrent *New Essays on Human Understanding* (1704) (henceforth NE). I will also reflect on whether the controversy could have ended in agreement if it would have continued longer.

The New System

Let us begin with the article that started the controversy, the New System. The article starts with Leibniz's objection to the Cartesian doctrine of extension as a basic way of explaining motion. Instead, one should adopt a doctrine of force which belongs to the sphere of metaphysics (GP IV 478). This is because one cannot find the principle of unity in mere matter, as

material things cannot be at the same time material and perfectly indivisible. Leibniz combined his new theory of forces or dynamics with the old scholastic doctrine of substantial forms, arguing that their nature consists in force in the sense that from it follows something analogous to feeling and desire which relates them to souls.² To put these together, substantial forms are, in a sense, souls which contain not only actuality or the fulfilment of possibility, but also an originating activity which Leibniz calls primary force (GP IV, 479).

According to Leibniz, the difference between minds and bodies is of kind rather than degree. Bodies or natural machines are machines, whatever change occurs in them (such as a caterpillar turning into a butterfly); whereas rational souls are above the changes in nature, as they are images of God. They possess unities, the ability to say “I”, which is never possible for machines of nature, even for animals (GP IV, 481–483). Thus spiritual machines are real unities with self-consciousness and moral identity; that is, they can systematically strive for happiness and perfection.

In the second part of the article Leibniz strives to show how these two kinds of machines work together. His explanation is founded on his doctrine of pre-established harmony, which God created with the substances, determining by a single act the relations between the substances, including the human soul and the aggregate that is its body. Leibniz also gives a lucid formulation of a spiritual automaton: a substance with an active principle (primitive force), reason (self-consciousness, will to good) and spontaneity (freedom). It strives automatically to the good, but is nevertheless free as it possesses intelligence and spontaneity. In addition, the representations of the substance are fairly accurate, and this is the reason

why it is able to strive to perfection in imitation of its creator, God (GP IV 486).

There were quite a number of critics of the New System, but I will here limit myself to Pierre Bayle (1647–1706), arguably the sharpest of them all. Bayle was a professor of history and philosophy in Rotterdam and was known primarily for his *Dictionnaire historique et critique* and his journal *Nouvelles de la république des lettres*. Leibniz's discussion with Bayle was very important and led partly to his only published work *Theodicy* (1710). The communication started when Bayle added an extensive footnote H to the article "Rorarius" in the first edition of his *Dictionnaire* (1697). Leibniz's response was published in *Histoire des ouvrages des savants* in 1698, but Bayle's reflections did not appear until 1702 when the second edition of the *Dictionnaire* was published (WF 68–69). Naturally Leibniz was very eager to read the edition once it was published and very quickly he wrote a reply to Bayle, choosing not to publish it despite Bayle's wish for him to do that. The reply was not published until 1716 in another journal called *Histoire critique de République des lettres*. Thus the discussion on New System took a very long time. In addition, Leibniz was privately busy reflecting Bayle's and others comments and several drafts of replies and letters were left unfinished. Thus there are several versions of letters he sent and did not send to Bayle and also his private notes on the article "Rorarius" (WF 69-70).³

Note H of "Rorarius"

Let us start with the footnote H to "Rorarius", where Bayle presented a counter-example to Leibniz's pre-established harmony between the mind and the body. He asks how a dog's soul can operate independently of its body if there is no direct interaction between them. If a dog is thought to be

more than a mere physical machine, a sort of intermediate level between machines of nature and spiritual machines, one would suppose that it has some sort of spontaneity, freedom to do what it chooses to do. Therefore Bayle cannot understand the series of spontaneous internal actions which could make a dog's soul feel pain immediately after having felt pleasure even if there was nothing else in the world (Bayle 1697: 697):

I can understand why a dog passes immediately from pleasure to pain when, whilst it is very hungry and eating some bread, it is suddenly hit with a stick; but that its soul should be constructed in such a way that it would have felt pain at the moment that it was hit, even if it had not been hit, and even if it had continued to eat the bread without being disturbed or prevented, that is what I cannot understand (Bayle 1697: 697; WF 73-74).

Bayle argues that according to Leibniz's views, the dog would feel pain even if there is no cause for it because the state of pain is "programmed" in its substantial form. Related to this question is the relationship between spontaneity and negative feelings. If we suppose that the soul has spontaneity or activity, how can it feel passivity or negative feelings such as pain? (Bayle 1697: 697). The assumption behind Bayle's argument is clearly that the natural continuation from pleasure is toward more pleasure and that a sudden change in the body would not necessarily take place in the soul at all (see also Rutherford 2005: 170). It is also evident, as Pelletier notes (2015: 165 & 170), that Bayle's take on spontaneity here is related to external factors, which was the common received view of the time; whereas for Leibniz the change is related to internal activity or passivity.

Bayle is in fact arguing that Leibniz's pre-established harmony is not really very different from Malebranche's and others occasionalism, as there would have to be God which guides the substances, that is, intervenes to produce the sudden change from pleasure to pain. Surely one cannot imagine that these kinds of sudden changes can happen simultaneously in the mind and the body if it is supposed that they follow their own laws? This is especially true of simple substances such as monads, as they would not have parts which would affect other parts in the substance.

Leibniz's Letter to the Editor, July 1698

Leibniz replied in a letter to the editor of the journal *Histoire des ouvrages des savants* in July 1698. He made a distinction between spontaneity and voluntariness. Everything voluntary is spontaneous, but there are spontaneous actions which are not chosen, and which consequently are not voluntary. The states of the soul are always connected to its past states (WF 81). By this Leibniz means that the past states are present in the soul in the form of dispositions, as minute, insensible perceptions (*petite perceptions*). We do not know distinctly the future states of the soul, but there are in each soul traces of everything that has happened to it before certain moment in its history and traces what will happen to it later (WF 83). Thus the substance's complete notion or substantial form "marks" the soul with tiny traces of its complete history. The spiritual machine has in this way a sort of complete program written by symbols, which to the agent herself looks like confused gibberish. Only its author, God, can interpret the code, hack the message (WF 83).

Because of this cognitive chaos in the soul there has to be an external principle in the production of one's actions. But this is not *deus ex machina*, as Bayle argues, because all the cognitive states of a substance

follow from each other naturally (although we do not always notice it). There is always a continuity between states of the soul which is due to the confused little perceptions which we are not aware of. Because of this there are only natural, not miraculous consequences in the soul. We are not usually aware of these perceptions because there is an infinite multitude of them and we cannot tell them apart (WF 83).

While Bayle holds that according to occasionalism, God acts according to general laws, Leibniz understands the term *miracle* in the sense that it exceeds the power of created things. This makes all of God's actions miraculous, however general they are thought to be (see also Jolley 2013). Leibniz thinks that if there is some occasion which is thought to be a general law, there must be a simpler or architectonic law of nature for one to avoid the charge of God acting miraculously: as an example Leibniz mentions gravity (WF 82). Finally, Leibniz comments on the simplicity of a substance, emphasizing its complexity. He argues that there are parts in the soul, though in itself it is a simple substance. These parts make up the affects or feelings of the soul. They are composed of several simultaneous perceptions.⁴ In addition, there is a law of order which exists in perceptions as much as in movements; each preceding perception influences succeeding ones, as we saw above.

The perceptions which are simultaneously together in the same soul involve a truly infinite multitude of small indistinguishable feelings that will be developed in what follows, so one should not be astonished at the infinite variety of what emerges over time. All of this is only a consequence of the representational nature of the soul, which must express what happens, and indeed what will happen, in its body; and, because of the connection or correspondence of all the parts of the world, it must also

express in some way what happens in all the other substances (WF 84-85). Thus each substance not only expresses its own body but through it all the other substances as well (WF 85).⁵

The Second Edition of Bayle's *Dictionnaire*

We have reached the stage in the discussion where the second edition of Bayle's *Dictionnaire historique et critique* was finally published in 1702. In the note H to the article "Rorarius" he further commented on Leibniz's views. In general, Leibniz's painstaking efforts at defending his system of pre-established harmony have been successful – Bayle is much more positively inclined to his views, saying that "I now consider this new system to be an important breakthrough, which advances the frontiers of philosophy" (Bayle 1702: 2610; WF 86). However, Bayle still does not admit that Leibniz's accusation towards occasionalism being a constant miracle is true, and therefore he has no need for Leibniz's new system of pre-established harmony. He also considers the view that substances are active in themselves problematic (Bayle 1702: 2610).

Bayle does not return to the dog -example,⁶ but presents another one concerning the union of soul and body of Caesar, in order to argue that the pre-established harmony greatly surpasses the imagination of men. If Caesar is given a substantial form or active primitive force which includes its whole history, does this notion really cover all the related little events during the course of his life without God's intervention? How can this be conceived at all? The problem is even more incomprehensible because of the infinite number of organic parts in the human mechanism which all are subject to effects of all the other bodies in the world.

How can we make sense of the fact that this pre-established harmony is never upset, and always stays on course through even the longest life of a man, despite the infinite variety of actions of all these parts one on another, surrounded on all sides by an infinity of corpuscles, sometimes cold, sometimes hot, sometimes dry, sometimes wet, always active, always pricking at the nerves, in this way or that? I think that this multiplicity of parts and of external agents is essential for the almost infinite variety of changes in the human body. But could this variety be as perfectly ordered as this system requires? Will it never disturb the correspondence between these changes and those of the soul? This is what seems to be quite impossible (Bayle 1702: 2611; WF 88).

When this function of the natural machine is connected to the spiritual machine, the picture is even more incredible to Bayle. As Leibniz claims, the two machines are both guided by the active force and correspond perfectly without any direct co-operation. This is simply not acceptable (Bayle 1702: 2611). Bayle proceeds by comparing the soul of Julius Caesar (understood as an immaterial automaton) to an epicurean atom which is surrounded by a void on all sides, never coming into contact with any other atom. According to Bayle, this comparison is very close, as the atom has a natural power of self-movement, and the soul of Caesar is a mind which can produce its thoughts without any influence from any other mind or body. Leibniz had earlier argued that a moving body will always retain its movement or progression if nothing occurs to make it change. Similarly the atom will keep on moving uniformly and regularly along the same straight line (Bayle 1702: 2611).

When this idea is applied to the soul of Caesar, we can see that if the first thought it gives itself is a feeling of pleasure, it is hard to see why the second thought should not be a feeling of pleasure as well. Bayle argues:

We could never make sense of the possibility of bizarre changes from black to white or from yes to no, or those wild leaps from earth to heaven which are quite common in human thought (Bayle 1702: 2612; WF 91).

In the second moment of its existence, the soul of Caesar does not acquire a new ability to think, but only keeps the ability it had in the first moment, being as independent from any external affect as in the first moment (Bayle 1702: 2611-2622). Thus Bayle still cannot see how in Leibniz's theory sudden changes are possible. If Caesar is suddenly pricked by a pin, how can the soul turn from pleasure to pain in a moment without being prepared for this sudden change?

He tries to hammer the point home with yet another example. Let us say that God has designed a bird which sings all the time a certain score. In order for that to happen, the score has to be imprinted in the memory of the animal or its muscles are arranged in such a way that mechanical movement produce that score. When this analogy is applied to man's soul, it is not enough, according to Leibniz, that the soul is able to give itself new thoughts, but also that it follows a certain sequence in its thoughts which correspond to the continual change in the body-machine. It does not seem believable that the soul cannot foresee the following states or the musical score it will experience in the future. But this is what Leibniz claims, as he holds that the soul senses the future perceptions only confusedly (Bayle 1702: 2512).

Leibniz's Last Reply

Leibniz's public last word was published in *Histoire critique de la république des lettres* in 1716, ten years after Bayle had died. To Bayle's argument that from pleasure there necessarily follows more pleasure, Leibniz argues that if we could predict the future states of the series of a substance, we could build a perfect robot (WF 109). Leibniz's final word is that even if the ideas of man are dispositional in the sense that they arise from previous ones, due to confusedness we cannot predict the future states and therefore they can be totally opposite to preceding states. Only God, whose cognition is infinite can analyse the complete history of the substances. In fact, that is the reason we exist in the first place, as God has chosen this set of substances to create. And the creation includes the idea that the substances are compatible; that is they harmonize with each other. Leibniz is ready to admit that with respect to bodies, his theory is mechanical, but with respect to soul, it is nothing like that.

So according to this second half of my theory, everything happens in the soul as if there were no body; just as, according to the first half, everything happens in the body as if there were no soul (WF 113). Therefore even if the soul represents the states of the attached body, it acts independently of it. Concerning the soul of Caesar and the question of sudden change, Leibniz argues that there is a great variety in the soul, unlike in an atom. Although like the atom, the soul is indivisible, it contains

A compound tendency, that is to say a multitude of present thoughts, each of which tends towards a particular change, depending on what is involved in it, and which are all in it at the same time, in virtue of its essential relatedness to all the other things in the world (WF 115).

The change from pleasure to pain may look sudden, but in addition to the continuous series of intermediate *petite perceptions* discussed above, there are a great number of different inclinations present at the same time in the soul, and the difference between the pleasure and pain is not as great as one might think. Leibniz argues: “So we need not be surprised by this change; it sometimes seems that pleasure is only a complex of small perceptions, each of which, if it were large, would be pain” (WF 116). Therefore the balance between pleasure and pain is very delicate.⁷

Leibniz’s Unpublished Comments and Notes (1705)

It is easy to see from the above that the communication between Bayle and Leibniz ended unresolved. Bayle was still confused about the question of sudden change, and, while accepting Leibniz’s pre-established system as an alternative solution to occasionalism, he still supported the latter.

However, there is a lot of interesting material preserved by Leibniz which did not end up in the communication and which sheds light to the topics. Let us first see Leibniz’s unpublished comments and notes to the second edition of the *Dictionnaire*. In the comments Leibniz returns to the example of the dog. He says that the pre-established harmony means that pain comes into a dog’s soul when its body is hit. If it is not hit, there is no mental event in the dog’s soul related to that physical event, as God would have seen the event through his foreknowledge. Therefore the law-of-the-series of the dog’s soul is perfectly synchronized to that of the aggregate that is its body. Bayle’s problem, as Leibniz sees it, is that he cannot see how the sudden change takes place without God causing it directly, as in occasionalism (through particular laws). In other words, Bayle fails to grasp the consequences of the pre-established harmony (GP IV 530). It is also important to see that the change is not sudden as it seems:

The causes which move the stick (that is, the man stationed behind the dog, getting ready to hit it while it eats, and everything in the history of the material world which contributes to his being in that position), are also represented in the dog's soul from the outset, exactly and truly, but feebly, by small confused perceptions and without apperception, that is, without the dog's knowing it – because the dog's body also is affected by them only imperceptibly. And just as in the history of the material world these dispositions eventually produce the blow firmly on the dog's body, so similarly the representations of these dispositions in the dog's soul eventually produce the representation of the blow of the stick; and since that representation is prominent and strong, the dog apperceives it very distinctly, and this is what constitutes its pain. So we don't have to imagine that in this encounter the dog's soul passes from pleasure to pain arbitrarily, and without any internal reason. (GP IV 531-532; WF 77).

So in the dog's soul there is a feeble disposition of getting hit by a stick; when this happens the obscure little unconscious perceptions or *petite perceptions* become more clear and when this development is heightened to its ultimate degree (the dog experiences the full effect of the hit), the dog perceives the pain distinctly. Because the hit of a stick received by the dog is only a disposition, the dog cannot know the future pain:

The principle of change is in the dog, the disposition of its soul moves imperceptibly toward giving it pain – but this is without its knowing, and without its wanting it. The representation of the present state of the universe in the dog's soul produces in it the representation of the subsequent

state of the same universe; just as in the things represented, the preceding state actually produces the subsequent state of the world. In a soul, the representations of causes are the causes of the representations of effects. And since this subsequent state of the world includes the blow on the dog's body, the representation of that subsequent state in its soul includes the pain which corresponds to that blow (WF 77).

When the dog is hit, the soul represents the cause (the hit) and the effect (pain). But before the first event and between these two events there are many intermediate insensible little perceptions. The soul of the dog is imperceptibly on its way to pain, but it is not aware of it. Only when the blow takes place, the soul feels the pain (“subsequent state of the world”) which has encountered its body due to pre-established harmony. In another unpublished note of 1705 we can find a similar case:

The soul sometimes passes from white to black or from yes to no, without knowing how, or at least involuntarily, for what its confused thoughts and its feelings produce in it we attribute to the body. So we should not be surprised if a man who is stung by some insect when eating jam should, despite himself, pass immediately from pleasure to pain. For, in approaching the man's body before stinging it, this insect was already affecting it, and the representation of this was, albeit unconsciously, already affecting his soul (WF 103).

Here a felt pleasure changes to pain suddenly, but again Leibniz emphasizes the great role of unconscious little perceptions in one's mental life:

In the soul as in the body, little by little the insensible becomes the sensible...nothing new happens in the substance of the

soul which makes it feel the sting; for what happens is confused presentiment, or, better, insensible dispositions of the soul, which represent the dispositions of the body with regard to the sting (WF 103).

Therefore the events of hitting the dog or stinging the jam-eating man are processes of which only some stages are perceived distinctly. I think Leibniz's explanations are satisfying in terms of understanding the sudden change, but it is also easy to agree with Rutherford that the dog is acting here as a patient rather than an agent and that it would not spontaneously move from pleasure to pain (Rutherford 2005: 171-172; Rutherford 2015: 204).⁸ The same holds true in the example of the jam-eating man. I think this fact cannot be resolved, but it can be understood – there are unfortunate events in the world and they are part and parcel of the history of the beings, evident to a supreme being who can analyse the law-of-the-series of the substances, but unpredictable to the substances themselves.

Some Reflections on the Outcome of the Controversy

The correspondence with Bayle is essential in understanding Leibniz's mature views of the soul and the psychophysical parallelism. Unlike many other critics, Bayle understood Leibniz's views fairly well and was sympathetic to them. Thus it is certain that the controversy was conducted under a spirit of tolerance which, according to Marcelo Dascal, is the first component of a positive attitude toward human difference (Dascal 2010: 27).

Bayle considered Leibniz's pre-established harmony as a viable alternative to his preferred system of occasionalism, but this is not to say that he would probably have been persuaded to adopt it. As we have

seen, there remained the problem of the nature of God's action on the world which the philosophers could not agree on. Bayle's criticism well represents the reactions to Leibniz's idea of pre-established harmony. Most thought of it as an interesting hypothesis which was very much estranged from reality.

It is certainly true that Leibniz could not demonstrate his hypothesis any more than Malebranche or other occasionalists could theirs. In this sense his pre-established harmony is not an improvement to Malebranche. In fact, to contemporaries it might have been more believable to think that God connects all things in the world from moment to moment (through laws of nature) than that he has created the substances in such a way that they perfectly correspond with each other from the start until the end of the world. In the eyes of the learned reading public, it seems probable that Bayle was the winner of the controversy. Be that as it may, the victory of occasionalism was not to last long – when Leibniz's *Theodicy* became fashionable in the first half of the eighteenth century, the supporters of occasionalism were few.

The case may be different with respect to spontaneity. Leibniz struggled to show to Bayle that the soul functions largely in terms of insensible petite perceptions and that the continuity of events is founded on them. But he had not yet published his *New Essays* at this point where he would explain their significance in detail. Leibniz discusses "small indistinguishable feelings" in his reply, but does not really explain their importance in his doctrine of the mind. Bayle was probably not aware of the systematic value of Leibniz's doctrine at all, as the insensible perceptions were implicitly mentioned only in his 1684 article *Meditationes de cognitione, veritate et ideis*, and the systematic presentation in NE was not published until 1765. This conjecture is supported by the fact that Bayle

does not comment on the little perceptions in the correspondence at all – perhaps he took Leibniz’s view as metaphorical. For him it may have looked as unintelligible as the hypothesis of pre-established harmony. One would suspect that if Leibniz had sent Bayle drafts of the *New Essays* (even the Preface), Bayle would have taken the doctrine more seriously.

In fact, I think that the *New Essays* is essential in understanding the communication between Bayle and Leibniz and that this has not been properly acknowledged.⁹ There are a number of common topics between the two sources, and many of them are discussed more extensively in NE. I will here mention only one example.

In NE II, xx, §6 Leibniz discusses passions in the context of Lockean concept of uneasiness; he argues that pleasure can be divided to minute semi-pleasures and only when they accumulate we can have the genuine pleasure. The same is true for pain – as Leibniz explained to Bayle, the pain the dog experiences is not a sudden change in metaphysical respect. It is a development of minute semi-sufferings which, put together, create the feeling of pain which the dog perceives. Although the process takes place in split seconds, it nonetheless is gradual. In his reply to Bayle in 1698 Leibniz already anticipated this view in NE, but his description of it is shallower and he does not use the terms *semi-pleasure* or *semi-suffering* of NE. One might suspect that Leibniz is here answering to both Locke (for whom passions are overwhelming states of unease which are difficult to resist) and Bayle – he wrote *New Essays* around the same time as the comments and notes to the second edition of *Dictionnaire*.

However, in NE he presents a theme not to be found in the communication. The process of minute semi-sufferings which starts when the stinging bee approaches the jam-eating man leads to a feeling of

imperfection or mental pain in the man when the bee stings him. The pain can be divided into innumerable semi-sufferings, and Leibniz argues that we can fight against the pain by replacing the semi-sufferings eventually with semi-pleasures. The direction of the affective process changes slowly, leading back to pleasure again. Therefore even though the man has experienced an unexpected and involuntary setback, he can systematically continue striving toward the good through semi-pleasures which will eventually accumulate to genuine pleasure (A VI 6 165). The mind is able to dig its own sources, with its appetite toward the good, and eventually experiences joy again (see also Rutherford 2015: 217-218). In this way the soul can evolve from imperfection to perfection, or in emotional terms, from harmful passions to intellectual emotions of joy, hope and love (for details, see Roinila 2012).

This discussion reflects the fact that Bayle is not really interested in Leibniz's complex theory of mind and its dynamics, due to the fact that he prefers occasionalism to the Leibnizian idea of a system of active substances. For him, the mind represents the external senses and the problem consists only of the uniform response to outer effects in the pre-established harmony. But for Leibniz, there are an infinite number of little, unconscious perceptions from the senses present at all times in the soul and they form "appetitions", imperceptible inclinations toward pleasure or pain which may conflict with each other. In addition to these inclinations in the soul which arise from the perceptions of the external senses, there is the internal appetite or endeavour toward the good (NE II, xxi, §5). So it seems to me that by his repeated observations on the infinite complexity of the mind Leibniz is really trying to explain to Bayle that while the mind does represent the states of the body, their effect on the mind is not as simple as

he thinks. This view is much more prominent in NE than in the communication.

As Leibniz's last extensive reply remained unpublished until ten years after Bayle's death, we can never know how the debate would have ended. One could speculate that at some point Leibniz could have given parts of his *New Essays* for Bayle to read and this would probably have greatly helped the discussion, as Bayle was also aware of Locke's thoughts and would perhaps have agreed with some of Leibniz's criticisms against them. In this way the conflict could have been converted to co-operation, although the topics of the controversy would perhaps have changed in the process. But I suspect Leibniz would not have been prepared to do this after Locke's death in 1704, as he decided to suppress the publication of NE. Sharing its contents would inevitably have led to exposure of the project, which would have been against his resolution to abandon it.

On the other hand, Leibniz was keen to win Bayle's support – in NE he frequently boasts of Bayle's acceptance of his hypothesis of pre-established harmony – but he was not prepared to give up any of his views. He had been opposing occasionalism for a long time due to arguments presented above. But I think one can say that both not only tolerated each other, they also understood each other in the sense that they were aware of each other's intentions.¹⁰

Notes

¹ When discussing the New System, I will refer to the post-publication revised version in GP IV 477-87 and the English translation in Leibniz 1997 (WF 10-20).

² Leibniz published his theory of forces in an article called *Specimen dynamicum* (part 1 appeared in *Acta eruditorum*, 1695).

³ A selection of the documents concerning the discussion following the publication of the New System is conveniently translated to English in WF.

⁴ Here Leibniz anticipates his view in *New Essays* II, xx, §6 as I will argue later.

⁵ This idea is quite Spinozistic. Compare *Ethics* 2p17.

⁶ I will return to the example later.

⁷ In *New Essays* (II, xx, §7) Leibniz argued that we can be cheerful when we are being tortured and feel depressed when we are having fun (A VI 6 166).

⁸ However, in another comment of 1705 Leibniz says that he does not think the soul gives itself its first feelings. They are received with its existence from God at the moment of creation and from the first feelings all the others follow (WF 102). Leibniz agrees here with his early view in *De Affectibus* (1679) where he, influenced by Hobbes, argued that affects follow from each other. Change in the series takes place only when a greater apparent perfection is encountered. See Roinila 2015.

⁹ A notable exception is Bolton 2013.

¹⁰ On tolerance leading to understanding each other within a controversy, see Dascal (2010: 27-32).

References

Bayle, Pierre (1697). *Dictionnaire critique et historique* (1ere ed.). Amsterdam: Reinier Leers. <http://tinyurl.com/qf6yg45>. Accessed 1 September 2015.

Bayle, Pierre (1702). *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (Seconde ed.). Rotterdam: Reinier Leers.

Bolton, Martha Brandt (2013). Change in the monad. In Eric Watkins (Ed.), *The Divine Order, the Human Order, and the Order of Nature. Historical perspectives* (pp. 175-194). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dascal, Marcelo (2010). The Challenge of Human Difference. In Giovanni Scarafile (Ed.), *A crua palavra. Conversation with Marcelo Dascal* (pp. 23-43). New York: Lulu Press.

Jolley, Nicholas (2013). Leibniz and occasionalism. In Nicholas Jolley, *Causality and mind. Essays on Early Modern Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm (1923). *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, Reihe I-VII. Herausgegeben von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der

Wissenschaften und der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen.
Berlin: Akademie. (A)

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm (1961). *Die philosophischen Schriften* I-VII. Herausgegeben von G. I. Gerhardt. Hildesheim: Olms (1880-90). (GP)

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm (1997). *Leibniz's "New System" and Associated Contemporary Texts*. (R. S. Woolhouse and Richard Francks, Ed. & Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (WF)

Pelletier, Arnaud (2015). Une dissection du chien de Bayle: La dernière lettre de Leibniz à Bayle ou l'origine de l'exposé monadologique. In Christian Leduc, Paul Rateau & Jean-Luc Sorère (Ed.), *Leibniz et Bayle: Confrontation et dialogue* (pp. 165-195). Stuttgart, Steiner.

Roinila, Markku (2012). Leibniz on hope. In Sabrina Ebbersmeyer (Ed.), *Emotional minds* (pp. 161-178). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Roinila, Markku (2015). Affects and activity in Leibniz's *De Affectibus*. In Adrian Nita (Ed.), *Between continuity and transformation: Leibniz on substance and substantial Forms* (pp. 73-88). Dordrecht: Springer.

Rutherford, Donald (2005). Leibniz on spontaneity. In Donald Rutherford and Jan Cover (Ed.), *Leibniz. Nature and freedom* (pp. 156-180). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rutherford, Donald (2015). Bayle's Dog and the Dynamics of the Soul. In Christian Leduc, Paul Rateau & Jean-Luc Sorère (Ed.), *Leibniz et Bayle: Confrontation et dialogue* (pp. 197-218). Stuttgart: Steiner.