THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ON

THE INTELLECTUAL LOVE OF GOD IN SPINOZA

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ERIK DREFF

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2017

To:

My wife, Ashley, and newborn son, Harvey.

You make the truth of Spinoza's

"all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare" (EVp42S)

a little less so.

Table of Contents

Abstract

In the following dissertation I argue that Spinoza's concept of the intellectual love of God (ILG) is a – if not the – cardinal concept and value in all of his thought and works. I begin with a discussion of the obstacles to understanding the concept as such, a review of the literature evidencing the various though consistent shortcomings in the scholarly engagements, and a typology of the problems facing a coherent understanding of the concept. I ground the dissertation's systematic examination of ILG throughout Spinoza's corpus in a comparative excursus on the concept of ILG in three key works by three key representatives of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition – a tradition I argue is essential for an adequate understanding of ILG in Spinoza, a tradition I argue he is very much a part of. Upon demonstrating the ubiquity of ILG as well as its rather consistent role and function throughout Spinoza's corpus, and thus throughout his life and thought, I conclude with a discussion of the fundamentality of ILG for an adequate understanding of his ethical, political, and religious thought, and thus indeed his philosophy as a whole, illustrating the explanatory strength of the concept, and thus, once again, its cardinality for Spinoza.

Acknowledgements

In the process of researching and writing this dissertation I have received abundant support – moral, spiritual, financial, and even physical – from a great many people and institutions. I give a hearty thanks and even a hug to them all, all of whom, ideally, are included below.

To my parents, for the love and support. Especially to my mother, Raya, for fatefully dog-earing the "Jewish Studies" page in the McGill course catalogue all those years ago, back when they printed those out, and to my father, Fima, for introducing me to and perfectly exemplifying the concepts of duty and fatherhood, just to name a few. To my brother, Leon, for that unique number crunching perspective, days on the golf course or nights at the PHISH show (and away from the dissertation), and the many late night texting funnies. To the Chicago Center for Jewish Studies, the Acton Institute, and the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and all their faculty and staff, for their generous financial and administrative support over the years. To the Center for Jewish History, for kindly shepherding me through their impressive and well-managed archives that summer. To the Jewish Studies Workshop of the University of Chicago, for the many deadlines that motivated my writing and beneficial opportunities to present and discuss my work in progress. To my many teachers, professors, advisors, peers, and colleagues, throughout my academic career, especially Professors Carlos Fraenkel and Paul Mendes-Flohr, for their invaluable lessons, discussions, arguments, prodding, pointers, advice, suggestions, comments, edits and emendations, etc., for their guidance, and on much more than just the following dissertation. Any errors or shortcomings and any sentences over 5 lines long that remain in the following are mine alone. To my friends, academic and lay, scattered across the hemisphere and beyond, for keeping me true to

myself and away from the middle. To the Grounds of Being Coffee Shop in the basement of Swift Hall, certainly one of the more hip java joints in the Midwest, for the copious Hail Mary's full of locally roasted caffeinated grace and the borderline revolutionary vibe of late. To the Div. School A.M. cohort of 2009: word. To the leadership and congregation of KAMII, for the passion and community, and, of course, the song and prayer. To my several squash partners over the years and the usual people on the basketball court Friday afternoons at Ratner, for balancing the academic life and "distressertating" with a healthy dose of lactic acid and a serious oxygen debt.

Finally, last but certainly not least, to my wife, Ashley, a recent PhD as well, for being the toughest and softest, strongest and most tender, soul (and always at just the right times), for the neck-rubs and smiles, the salads and the pies, for being my partner, my muse, my light, my love, and an amazing mom; and to my newborn son, Harvey, for colouring and brightening my every day, for making my house a home, for filling my life with the joys (and cries) of family. I love you both more than words can express.

"Love is strong as death."

- Song of Songs, 8:6

"All you need is love, Love.

Love is all you need."

- The Beatles

I. Spinoza and the Intellectual Love of God

I.A. Why the Intellectual Love of God.

To suggest a study of the concept of the intellectual love of God (*amor Dei intellectualis* - ILG)[1] in the thought of Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677)[2] is at once both obvious and perplexing.[3] It is obvious for its place in the *Ethics* (Posthumous - 1677),[4] as the final, and thus, arguably, crowning concept of his chief philosophical work,[5] and even for its prominence and role throughout his

---

[1] Spinoza was knowledgeable in Portuguese, Spanish, Hebrew, Dutch, Latin, and maybe even French. He wrote in Latin for all but one of his works (the *Short Treatise on God, Man, and His Well-Being* , hereafter *KV*, originally in Dutch), as well as in some of his letters. Spinoza thus employs the Latin term *amor Dei intellectualis*, and many others (to be discussed in Chapter III, below), for the concept of the intellectual love of God. My use of the acronym ILG, corresponding to the English '**i**ntellectual **l**ove of **G**od,' as opposed to ADI, corresponding to the Latin '**a**mor **D**ei **i**ntellectualis,' requires a brief note then. My intention is simple, and stems from a deep appreciation of the history of the term 'amor Dei intellectualis' in the Christian tradition. Thus, my intention is to merely decrease the likelihood of any importation of assumptions or expectations from the Christian tradition on behalf of the reader regarding what Spinoza meant, and to bracket this issue for another day. Certainly, Spinoza used the Latin words 'amor Dei intellectualis', among many others, to denote the concept at issue, but that was, in large part, in consideration of his audience, much like my use of ILG is in consideration of mine. Would it make sense to do so, I would use the Hebrew term, אהבת אלוהים השכלית, for it is almost certain that it was through the Jewish tradition that he was acquainted with the idea initially (See Chapter II below for but three instances). In the end, I find that my use of ILG intends nothing over and above what ADI would, as well as misses nothing that ADI would require, while it has at least some benefit, as outlined above. Therefore, I find ILG apropos.

[2] For a comprehensive modern biography of Spinoza, "the first full-length and complete biography of Spinoza ever to appear in English," see: Steven Nadler, *Spinoza: A Life* (Cambridge University Press, 1999). Also of note, Richard Popkin, *Spinoza* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2004). For biographies more proximate to Spinoza's time though not necessarily more accurate, see: John Colerus, *The Life of Benedict de Spinosa* (1705) in Pollock's *Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy* (1880), pp. 393-428, and Jean Maximilian Lucas' *The Life of the Late Mr. de Spinosa* (1719) in A. Wolf (ed.), *The Oldest Biography of Spinoza* (1927). For two major biographies representative of late 19th and early 20th century German scholarship, see: Freudenthal (1899) and Gebhardt (1914). Also of interest, see: Wolfson (1934), Yovel (1989, Vol. 1), for more intellectual history; Yovel (1989, Vol. 2), Israel (2001, 2006, 2010 & 2011), and several others, many of whom can be found in the notes below, for Spinoza's influence on modernity; and Daniel Schwartz, *The First Modern Jew: Spinoza and the History of an Image* (Princeton University Press, 2013) for his influence on modern Jewish identity.

[3] "Scholars, whether they desiderate the *amor* [*Dei Intellectualis*] or not, will grant that the *amor* [*Dei Intellectualis*] is both the consummation and the most neglected aspect of Spinoza's thought," Maxwell (1990), p. 132.

[4] The full title of the work is: *Ethica: Ordine Geometrico Demonstrata et in Quinque Partes Distincta* (The Ethics: Demonstrated in Geometric Order and Divided into Five Parts). I will follow standard citation practices of Part (Roman numerals), Proposition (p), Demonstration (d), Definition (D), Axiom (A), Lemma (L), Scholium (S), and Corollary (C). Thus, EVp42S refers to the Scholium of Proposition 42 of Part five of the *Ethics*. However, contrary to the practice of citing the page numbers of the Gebhardt edition, 4 Vols. (1925), which is out of print, and is rarely available on hand to anyone but professional, and apparently rich, Spinozists, all page number references are to the far more affordable and accessible *Spinoza: Complete Works*, trans. by Samuel Shirley (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002), hereafter *Works*.

[5] The point, central to this dissertation, that ILG is the crowning concept of the *Ethics* (let alone the rest of his corpus), and thus not to be dismissed or explained away as a "sublime addendum to the *Ethics*, rather than as its intrinsic consummation" (Maxwell (1990), p. 135), will be made abundantly clear in and throughout the dissertation. For now: even were it not written *more geometrico*, in a geometric method, placement at the end of a work is certainly a placement of importance, if only as an end, as a conclusion, but also, clearly, and especially in this case, much more. The geometric

corpus.[6] It is perplexing for its appearing to be inconsistent with certain other and assumedly more important propositions and concepts of the *Ethics*.[7] It is thus all too often deemed to be an "incoherence"[8] or inconsistency of Spinoza's philosophy, including even his political thought as well.[9] Consider also the sheer complexity of the concept itself. The concept of ILG does involve, after all, the intellect, love, and God. Certainly no meagre concepts in themselves, each of them

---

method of exposition of the *Ethics*, however, with its grounding in Definitions and Axioms and continuing only through either those or propositions proven directly therefrom, only furthers the point being made. This is insofar as the final proposition(s) can be seen as the logical conclusion of the initial assumptions and thus as the ultimate intention or "intrinsic consummation" of the geometric work as a whole. "Unlike the other two [parts of the *Ethics*], which coexist throughout the entire course, it [EV] occupies a precise place, the final one. Nonetheless it was there from the start as a focus, the focal point that was already at work before it appeared. Book V must be conceived as coextensive with all the others; we have the impression of arriving at it, but it was there all the time, for all time," Deleuze (1997), p. 30. The geometric method of the *Ethics* is, of course, ultimately grounded in Euclid's *Elements*, and Spinoza's use of it can be seen as a direct rejoinder to Descartes, who did not think that metaphysics was prone to the certainty and rigidity of exposition entailed by the geometric method. For more on the geometric method in Spinoza, see: Wolfson (1934, pp. 3-60), Curley (1988). Finally, the concept of immortality, the eternity of the mind, one of the resulting effects of ILG, though arguably later in the work, is not essential to it. EVp41, the second last proposition of the work, reads: "Even if we did not know that our mind is eternal, we should still regard as being of prime importance piety and religion [i.e. the ethics of the *Ethics*] and, to sum up completely, everything which in Part IV we showed to be related to courage and nobility" namely, ILG.

[6] The prominence, role, and function of ILG throughout the corpus of Spinoza, over and above the *Ethics*, generally unrecognized in the scholarship, will be demonstrated below (Chapter III-IV). For now, it should suffice to merely state that the concept of ILG, referred to by various terms, is quite simply not only ubiquitous in the writings of Spinoza, but does an incredible amount of work in and throughout his thought. Cf. fn. 5 above for its importance place in and thus importance for the *Ethics*, which, being his chief philosophical work, in turn suggests the importance of the concept for his thought as a whole.

[7] Most often EIIp7, "The order and connection of ideas is the same as the order and connection of things," *Works,* p. 247.

[8] This particular label goes back at least as far as Taylor (1937, 1972), and has been taken as apt for the topic of ILG by most scholars of Spinoza. Cf. Curley (1977), Bennett (1984), for just a couple of examples. I obviously disagree, and the present dissertation should prove why.

[9] The argument that ILG is inconsistent with Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (1670 (Hereafter *TTP*)), or political thought as a whole is rarely, if ever, explicitly stated. Echoing the long-standing trope of dismissing Spinoza as a mystic, Feuer (1958) may be the most explicit case against ILG's consistency with (his interpretation of) Spinoza's political thought, though it is not particularly strong. Feuer understands Spinoza, in writing about ILG, to be a "mystic metaphysician" with the "Utopian metaphysic" of his earlier (Jewish) thinking attempting to "graft the doctrine of the intellectual love of God onto the more scientific conception of God and nature of his later years;" In later propositions of EV, "Spinoza the mystic simply abandons the structural order of his metaphysics" (pp. 221-224). More often than not, however, the literature either completely ignores ILG in considerations of his political thought, as it does generally, or it devotes, at most, a brief section, usually towards the end, that, at best, suggests ILG, indicating its existence and perhaps consistency with the preceding interpretation of Spinoza. "If writing books, they have allotted some portion of a chapter to presenting the *amor*. If writing articles, they have mentioned it," Maxwell (1990), p. 133. There is little to no analysis. I am thus taking neglect or absence of ILG in studies of Spinoza's political thought as an implicit argument against its coherence with and even relevance for Spinoza's political thought.

There are, of course, and thankfully, recent exceptions, scholars who at least engage ILG in their discussions of Spinoza's political thought, if to varying degrees. "With a few exceptions [footnoting two], the existing literature on the *TTP* pays little attention to the metaphysical doctrines of the book," Melamed (2010), p. 128. The literature review below (I.1.B) will discuss the scholarship on ILG in Spinoza's political thought specifically as well.

garners a whole Part, and more, of the *Ethics* to themselves,[10] and connect to, in one way or another, the entirety of the dense book. Furthermore, by simply enumerating the propositions referred to in the proofs to the propositions demonstrating ILG (EVp15-20, 32-37), and those of the propositions in those further propositions, and so on, one is sure to attain to the majority of the propositions in the entire *Ethics*, if not all of them. This lends further support to the claim made earlier that ILG is the "crowning concept" of the work, insofar as ILG is dependent on, quite literally, and is in turn the culmination of, the entirety of the *Ethics*.[11] Spinoza's particular conception of ILG aside, one must also be mindful that the concept of ILG has a long standing and prominent place in the history of Jewish thought,[12] let alone the history of thought *simpliciter*.[13] Finally, one must reckon with the modern audience whose general disposition, grounded in a modern scientific worldview, against things theological seems only to be increasing, making any kind of rapprochement with the concept of ILG equally increasingly difficult and unlikely, if even meaningful.[14] Hence "… we shall see the

---

[10] God is the principle subject of Part I. Intellect or the human mind is that of Part II. Love, defined originally in Part III, developed in Part IV, receives full expression in the second half of Part V.

[11] Cf. fn. 5 & 6 above, and Ch. III.E. below, for a discussion of the importance of the location of ILG in the work for the concept of ILG and the work itself.

[12] See Chapter II below for a discussion of several major points of contact between, if not the influence of, the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition on Spinoza's concept of ILG.

Though not mediated by the intellect until the saturation of Hellenic thought into Judaism, the basic concept has its roots in Deut. 6:5, "And thou shalt love the Lord they God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might," numerous other passages (E.g. Deut. 10:2, 10:19, 11:1, 13; 13:3; Lev. 19:18), and has a consistent historical presence and value throughout Jewish history.

Spinoza was well aware of its Biblical origin. "For from Scripture itself we learn that its message, unclouded by any doubt or any ambiguity, is in essence this, to love God above all, and one's neighbour as oneself" (Spinoza, *TTP*, Ch. 12, *Works*, p. 508).

Curiously, despite widespread agreement on his importance in history, even Jewish history, Spinoza's concept of the love of God is missing in two of the major scholarly works on the concept of the love of God in Jewish thought. Cf. Vajda (1957), Levenson (2016).

[13] There is a large amount of literature on this topic across all three Abrahamic religions alone, the world religions, and the history of philosophy. For only the tip of the iceberg, mostly focusing outside of Judaism: Boros, De Dijn, et al. (eds.), *The Concept of Love in 17th and 18th Century Philosophy* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007); Christopher Morgan (ed.), *The Love of God* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2016). Cf., Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 36.

[14] Cohen (1923), p. 4, explicitly explains the lack of scholarly attention to ILG in Spinoza with reference to the intellectual "temper" of the age. "Without at all pretending that the Spinozistic system is free from difficulties and even inconsistencies, I think that a due appreciation of the doctrine of *amor Dei intellectualis* will lead us to see that most of the traditional difficulties have arisen from trying to harmonize Spinoza with the expositor's own views," p. 12. Cf. Bidney (1940), p. viii, "…avoid the extremes of those who commit the normative fallacy by reading into Spinoza ideas which belong to a subsequent period, as well as the narrowness of the classical scholars who interpret his thought entirely by

amor [*Dei intellectualis*] essentially neglected in the scholarship of the last century," and "…what has come to be an almost total neglecting of the intellectual love of God in Spinoza studies."[15] Sadly, with only a few exceptions, reviewed below,[16] not much has changed in the quarter century since the preceding quotation was originally published. Therefore, despite the fact that "philosophers and scholars have always, until quite recently, paid their respects to the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*] as the consummation of Spinoza's thought,"[17] ILG remains confounding, elusive, if not mysterious.[18]

Taking a cue from Spinoza,[19] we search for an antecedent cause of or reason for the modern disposition and other obstacles preventing a clear and distinct understanding of the concept of ILG in Spinoza in order to understand and overcome them. Curiously enough, we find Spinoza as a common root cause.[20] A significant moment in history and a major thinker in the history of philosophy, Spinoza is widely recognized as a central source for and force in the development and maturation of the Enlightenment and in turn Western modernity.[21] He can thus safely be said to

---

reference to past traditions." In other words, both Cohen and Bidney find that the inability, willful or not, to take the concept of ILG seriously, to view it as germane to the thought of Spinoza, and in turn to make sense of it, is indicative of the substantial gap that exists between the disparate values and *weltanschauungen* of scholars from that of their subject matter and their inability to overcome that gap. My argument here agrees with both Cohen and Bidney.

[15] Maxwell (1990), p. 132-133.

[16] I.B. below.

[17] Maxwell (1990), p. 132.

[18] "I long thought the obscurity of the last portion of the 'Ethics' all but hopeless," Pollock (1880), p. 280. For something more recent, Bennett is worth quoting here at length: "The final one-twentieth of the work, from 5p23 to the end, contains a failure of a different order – an unmitigated and seemingly unmotivated disaster. I would like to excuse myself from discussing it" (p. 357); "after three centuries of failure to profit from it, the time has come to admit that this part of the *Ethics* has nothing to teach and is pretty certainly worthless...we should say openly that Spinoza is [in the latter half of EV] talking nonsense and that there is no reason for us to put up with it" (pp. 372/3); "Those of us who love and admire Spinoza's philosophical work should in sad silence avert our eyes from the second half of Part 5" (p. 375).

[19] EIA4, *Works*, p. 218.

[20] Wolfson (1934), Vol. 1, p. vii, playing on the Latin and Hebrew versions of Spinoza's first name, famously quipped, "Benedictus is the first of the moderns; Baruch is the last of the medievals." Obviously no single thinker is responsible for any single aspect of modernity, their standing on the shoulders of giants, so to speak, as well as the nigh infinite complexity and abundance of influencing factors determining each and every minute aspect of modernity. Spinoza is, however, and undoubtedly, a monumental game-changing presence in history, period. This should become quite clear shortly.

[21] "It would be difficult to mention any contemporary issue in metaphysics or ethical and political philosophy in which Spinoza has not said something that is still laden with pregnant significance… few philosophers contain so much that is still so apt and modern… a central figure in the world's great stream of religious, political, and scientific thought," Cohen (1923), p 3. Also: Wolfson (1934, Preface; 1961, pp. 1-26, 217-272); Israel (2001, 2006 (esp. pp. 15-25), 2010, and

have helped cause and form, in a variety of ways, with some being more direct and obvious than others, the modern disposition that so prevents us from understanding ILG. His daring (pantheist) identification of God with nature, *Deus sive Natura*,[22] helped the materialist tendencies of modernity. His philosophical idealism, on the other hand, along with several other ideas of his, was known to and impacted the thought of such seminal thinkers as Leibniz,[23] Hegel,[24] Marx,[25] and Nietzsche.[26] Indeed, much of late 18th and -19th -century German philosophy, culture, and beyond, was rooted in and a reflection on Spinoza.[27] His deeply rationalist philosophy and immanent determinism helped to ground and develop modern science with its search for causal laws.[28] He is one of the first

---

2011) argues convincingly, if at length, for the foundational and critical influence of Spinoza on all of modernity, framing both the "radical" and the "moderate" Enlightenment, as well as the French Revolution, in short, Western modernity, as responses to Spinoza, if variously reflected through cultural representatives. "On Spinoza's principles, society would become more resistant to being manipulated by religious authority, autocracy, powerful oligarchies and dictatorship, and more democratic, libertarian and egalitarian," Israel (2010), p. 2. While Israel may be said to have overstated the case, in principle, evidence, and argument, he is not wrong; "Spinoza's theory of mind is by general consent one of the greatest contributions ever made to human understanding," Matson (1971), p. 577. There are a lot more quotes to choose from. Most recent books on Spinoza will kindly offer a few in the first dozen pages or so.

[22] EIVPreface, EIVp7; *TTP*, Ch. 6, *Works*, p. 447.

[23] Georges Friedmann, *Leibniz et Spinoza* (1946), esp. Chs. 9-10, pp. 164ff; *Studia Spinozana*, Vol. 6 (1990), is dedicated to the central theme of "Spinoza and Leibniz"; Jacqueline Lagree, "Leibniz et Spinoza" in *Disguised and Overt Spinozism Around 1700* (1996); Matthew Stewart, *Courtier and the Heretic* (2006), esp. pp. 170ff; Nadler (2008); Michael V. Griffin, "Necessitarianism in Spinoza and Leibniz" in *Interpreting Spinoza: Critical Essays* (2008), pp. 71-93. Laerke, Moreau, et al (eds), *Spinoza et Leibniz: Rencontres, Controverses, Receptions* (2014).

[24] Yirmiyahu Yovel, "Spinoza and Hegel: The Immanent God – Substance or Spirit?" in Yovel (ed.), *Spinoza and Other Heretics: The Adventures of Immanence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), pp. 27-50, 196-201. Pierre Macherey, *Hegel ou Spinoza* (Paris: Maspero, 1979).

[25] Yirmiyahu Yovel, "Spinoza and Marx: Man-in-Nature and the Science of Redemption" in Yovel (ed.) (1989), Vol. 2, pp. 78-103. "Spinoza's thought, adapted to the philosophical needs of the time, remained at the foundation of Marx's later thinking, almost as deeply rooted and as present as it had been to Hegel and as Hegel has been to Marx," p 78. Spinoza's dismal estimation of the idea of revolution also greatly influenced Marxism (Moreau (2003), p. 3). See also: *Cahiers Spinoza*, Vol. 1 (Paris: Editions Replique, 1997), esp. the first four chapters, which include an article by Marx on Spinoza's *TTP* and correspondence, as well as several reflections on Spinoza in Marx; Idit Dobbs-Weinstein, *Spinoza's Critique of Religion, and its Heirs: Marx, Benjamin, Adorno* (NY: CUP, 2015).

[26] Shlomo Pines, "Nietzsche: Psychology vs Philosophy, and Freedom" and Yirmiyahu Yovel, "Nietzsche and Spinoza: *Amor dei* and *Amor fati*," both in Yovel (ed.), *Nietzsche as Affirmative Thinker: Papers Presented at the Fifth Jerusalem Philosophical Encounter, April 1983* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1986), pp. 147-159, 182-203, respectively.

[27] *Spinoza and German Idealism* , eds. Forster and Melamed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Eckart Forster, *The Twenty-Five Years of Philosophy*, trans. by Brady Bowman (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012); Frederick Beiser, *German Idealism: The Struggle against Subjectivism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), esp. pp. 350ff; Ibid., *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), esp. pp. 44-108. Vallee (1988). Bell (1984 (Diss., 1980).

[28] Einstein, one of the greatest scientific minds in human history, when asked about his belief in God, likened his understanding to that of Spinoza's God, a God expressed through and in nature. "I believe in Spinoza's God, who reveals himself in the lawful harmony of the world, not in a God who concerns himself with the fate and the doings of

political theorists to advocate for a religiously tolerant[29] liberal democracy,[30] grounded in a separation of Church and State,[31] thus influencing Locke and Rousseau,[32] and a whole cadre of modern political thinkers, movements, and ideologies. His radical critique of religion in the *TTP*, and its concomitant hermeneutical project, discussed in Chapter 7 of the work, helped to generate the modern field of biblical criticism and, in turn, literary criticism.[33] The critical understanding of Judaism and religious orthodoxy peppered throughout the *TTP*, forever changed our understanding of the Jewish

---

mankind" (1929). Interestingly, if tangential, Einstein wrote the Forward to the *Spinoza Dictionary*, ed. Dagobert D. Runes (New York: Philosophical Library, 1951), and was to chair a conference and edit a volume on his works, but was eventually forced to decline, on advice from his wife, for being far too overcommitted on too many things (CJH, Fritz Bamberger Collection 1901-2001).

[29] The extent of the religious tolerance put forth by Spinoza in his political works may be debated, especially in light of Ch. 18 of the TTP. It is my understanding though, that, principally, and at least initially, before free and rational debate successfully and demonstrably refutes and dissuades the adherents of less rational religions, and before the state civil religion is itself made completely rational, or clearly defines what constitutes an enemy of the state, one is free to think what they will on matters of piety and religious service. On a longer timeline, too, this principled freedom of religion is maintained, but with the lone added caveat that it not cause or entail seditious actions of any kind.

[30] Steven B. Smith (1994, 2005).

[31] The subtitles of chapters 14 and 15 of the *TTP*, respectively, are, "An Analysis of faith, the faithful and the fundamental principles of faith. Faith is finally set apart from philosophy" and "It is demonstrated that neither is theology ancillary to reason nor reason to theology. The reason why we are convinced of the authority of Holy Scriptures." Though the separation of faith and philosophy is not identical to that of church and state, the points and arguments put forth by Spinoza on the issue of the relationship between faith, theology, and church / institutional religion, on the one hand, and philosophy and statecraft, on the other, especially in these two chapters, were foundational in the development and justification of what would later be called the separation of church and state. ILG in Spinoza's political thought will be taken up again in Chapter III, especially Ch. III.D and F, as well as in IV.B.

Incidentally, the nature of this separation has often been taken as absolute, which is an overly simplistic if not distorted understanding or derivation of Spinoza. The ceremonial observances of a religion, its external acts, are, according to Spinoza, as all external acts are, certainly within the jurisdiction of the absolute power of the sovereign. Anything susceptible to causal explanation for Spinoza, which is technically everything that is possibly or actually existing (cf. Della Rocca , 2008, for a masterful presentation of the Principle of Sufficient Reason at work in the thought of Spinoza), falls under the purview of the Sovereign and State, whereas the nature of an imagined or falsely conceived Deity and its revealed demands on humankind, so long as they entail no actions contrary to the State, fall under the purview of a subject's free speech.

Returning to the point, however, on the difference between faith/philosophy and church/state, it is on the question of the truth of religious conceptions of the Deity and its revealed demands that the difference between faith/philosophy and church/state arises, insofar as were the Deity to in fact be as imagined, and have the demands imagined, then faith/philosophy and church/state would not be so separable., the state would need to consult theologians on the details of God's will and revelation. However, that this is not the case has been proven, at least according to Spinoza, and so to assure the objectivity and soundness of policy, to assure good government, non-scientific conceptions of the Diety, insofar as they are innocuous, are deemed politically irrelevant – thus the separation.

[32] For Locke: Goldstein (2006), 259ff.; Klever (1995); as well as both Brown (pp. 213-234) and Klever (pp. 235-260) in *Disguised and Overt Spinozism Around 1700* (1996). For Rousseau: Cooper (2013), esp. pp. 70-139.

[33] Preus (2001), Norris (1991), esp. pp. 177-216.

religion,[34] if not all revealed faiths.[35] An off-hand comment of Spinoza's about the Jewish religion, its Law, possibly becoming valid once again, if only the Jews were to have a state to legitimate and enforce their laws, has led some to consider him a proto-Zionist.[36] This lone passage, *inter alia*, was invoked in an attempt by Joseph Klausner of the Hebrew University in 1927, on the 250th anniversary of Spinoza's death, to rescind Spinoza's excommunication and extol his name as a brother of the Jewish people.[37] Even how he lived his life itself, though highly controversial in the ideas he espoused in his writings, was taken as emblematic of the modern individual,[38] or even the modern secular Jew.[39] This is insofar as, despite belonging to no formal religion after his excommunication in 1656,[40] and espousing highly controversial atheist (which at the time meant immoral) ideas, he lived a quiet and peaceable life, and demurred from clamor as much as possible[41]

---

[34] Batnitzky (2011) finds Mendelssohn's response to Spinoza's critical definition of Judaism as political law, not revealed and thus universal law, and thus irrelevant outside of a Hebrew state, i.e. in post-biblical times, to be largely responsible for our modern understanding of Judaism as a "religion." The ensuing debates, some of which fanned out from Germany by the early 19th C., are seen by Batnitzky as largely responsible for our modern understanding of the term and category of "religion" itself.

[35] Strauss (1930/65, 1935/95), Wolfson (1934).

[36] *TTP*, Ch. 3, *Works*, p. 425.

[37] Yovel (1977) has the date as 1925.

[38] Schleiermacher, himself influenced by Spinoza, identified in the historical Spinoza the ideal sufferer. Cf., Julia A. Lamm, *The Living God: Schleiermacher's Theological Appropriation of Spinoza* (Pennsylvania: University Park, 1996).

[39] Recall Wolfson's famous quip (1934, Vol. 1, p. vii), "Benedictus is the first of the moderns…" "In abandoning the observant Judaism of his day, but refusing to convert to Christianity, Spinoza unwittingly embodied the alternatives which lay in wait for Jews of later religions... Spinoza prefigures a number of the problems stemming from the encounter of Judaism with the modern world," Yovel (1977), p. 52. Schwartz (2013) chronicles the various ways in which Spinoza was culturally remembered and reimagined as well as put to use in the formation of modern Jewish identities over the centuries. Especially notable are Berthold Auerbach's *Spinoza, A Historical Novel* (1837) and I.B. Singer's *Spinoza of Market Street* (1944/61), both dealt with by Schwartz. Also: Yirmihayu Yovel, "Epilogue: Spinoza and His People: The First Secular Jew?" in Yovel (ed., 1989), pp. 172-204.

[40] For the text of the writ of excommunication or *herem*, see: Paul Mendes-Flohr, *Jew and the Modern World* (1995), p 57. Yovel (1977), Kasher & Biderman (2001 (Original 1990)), Nadler (1999), and Popkin (2004), and in Ravven & Goodmann (eds.) (2002), also have excellent discussions on the question of why he was excommunicated. Nadler (2001) suggests that the denial of miracles, creation, mosaic authorship, as well as the immortality of the soul, account for the "evil opinions" that "warranted" the excommunication. I disagree with the last of these items. My argument, in short, is that ILG, and its concomitant effect, immortality, are present in his earliest writings and throughout his lifetime, suggesting a lifelong commitment to the idea, though perhaps not to any of the existing theories and proofs for it with which he was acquainted. This should become clear in Chapter III below.

[41] "All the better; they do not force me to do anything that I would not have done of my own accord if I did not dread scandal…," from Lucas' *The Life of the Late Mr. De Spinoza* (1719) in Wolf (1927), p. 51.

– facts that have bothered his philosophical and spiritual detractors to no end.[42] It is thus undeniable that, through the above ideas and people, as well as many others,[43] Spinoza helped, and substantially too, to usher in the modern Western secular liberal age.[44]

Nevertheless, Spinoza was no atheist.[45] Moreover, though he staunchly critiqued theocracy as well as the reigning biblical hermeneutics he saw as grounding and legitimating theocratic power, Spinoza, I argue, could scarcely imagine a world without canonical texts, or even the belief in revelation.[46] He was a liberal democrat who championed the freedom of thought (*libertas*

---

[42] Bayle (1697), in Wolf (1927), p. 163, "Those who associated with Spinoza, and the peasants in the villages in which he lived for some time in retirement, are unanimous in saying that he was a man it was good to associate with, affable, honest, obliging, and very correct in his moral. This is strange." "He had a courteousness which was more like that of the Court than that of a commercial city such as he was born in, and one may say of it that it had no vices or faults. Although this kind of life was utterly opposed to his principles and to his taste, he submitted to it with as much complacency as the courtiers themselves," from Lucas, *The Life of the Late Mr. De Spinoza* (1719), in Wolf (1927), p. 63. "The life of Spinoza reveals a harmony of conviction, theory, and practice, such as the history of philosophy but rarely exhibits. It is… at once the foundation and mirror of his teaching," Freudenthal (1899), translated and cited in A. Wolf, "Review: Professor Freudenthal's "Spinoza"" in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (Apr., 1899), p. 495. Freudenthal (1899), esp. Section III, pp. 191-238, has a good number of documents discussing Spinoza's life and works, many of whom express such incredulousness. "Spinoza, according to all seventeenth-century interpreters, rejected all the traditional ideas about God; he was indisputably a heretic. Yet his manner of living was humble and apparently free of vice. Then, as now, the philosopher seemed a living oxymoron: he was an ascetic sensualist, a spiritual materialist, a sociable hermit, a secular saint. How could his life have been so good, the critics asked, when his philosophy was so bad?" Stewart (2006), p. 73.

[43] "More, perhaps, than most systems of philosophy, that of Spinoza has been subjected to this sort of misconstruction. Doctrines the most diversified and contradictory have been extracted from it. Pantheism and atheism, idealism and empiricism, nominalism and realism, a non-theistic naturalism as uncompromising as that of the modern evolutionist, and a supernaturalism or acosmism which has as little of the world as the Maya of the Buddhist – have all alike found a colourable sanction in Spinoza's teaching," Caird (1888), p. 2. "Few philosophical oeuvres have given rise to such utterly divergent and even opposed "readings," readings not confined to a single commentator but common to entire centuries," Montag and Stolze (eds.) (1997), p. xii.
His influence on Freud and psychoanalyses is but one example. Cf. Yirmiyahu Yovel, "Spinoza and Freud: Self-Knowledge as Emancipation" in Yirmiyahu Yovel (ed., 1989), pp. 136-166. 217-221; Michael Mack, *Spinoza and the Specters of Modernity: The Hidden Enlightenment of Diversity from Spinoza to Freud*, 1st edition (N.Y: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010). Montag and Stolze, in the "Preface" to their *The New Spinoza* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997, p.ix, offer Lacan, Foucault, and Derrida, as well. Our modern understanding of the emotions, psychology, and neuroscience are but two more.

[44] Feuer (1958), Mason (1997), Israel (2001, 2006, 2010, 2011), Goldstein (2006), Goetschel (2004), Mack (2010), Kisner (2011). In fact, almost every recent book on Spinoza begins with or is shortly thereafter obliged to present a declaration of Spinoza's importance for modernity and the aspect/s of modernity the book focuses on or concludes with a view to.

[45] Ep. 30 (1665), where he explicitly states that he intends to write a treatise (the *TTP*) that will effectively explain away the charge of atheism levied against him so much of late. Despite the utter failure of the work to achieve this end, I take Spinoza at his word. I cannot comprehend how others do not.

[46] Considering the popular image of Spinoza, this may *prima facie* seem as a surprise or counter-intuitive. However, there is significant evidence to support this, with some more substantial than others. There is, of course, Spinoza's own words in the letter just cited above (fn. 45), where he explicitly denies being an atheist. Philosophical anthropologically, according to Spinoza, we are not and cannot ever be fully rational beings. Furthermore, there will almost always be

philosophandi).[47] But, and this is the crux of my argument, Spinoza also valued, perhaps even cardinally, the intellectual love of God. Moreover, he judged all else in his system, including and even freedom of thought, by its measure. "If not the first, then at least one of the first modern political thinkers to embrace democracy,"[48] Spinoza was one of the grandfathers of the modern liberal tradition. He was a staunch critic of superstitious religion, dogmatic biblical hermeneutics, and theocracy of any kind, and a rationalist and determinist who denied miracles, a personal God, and identified God with Nature. However, Spinoza also upheld what is perhaps one of the most theological values and concepts there are – the intellectual love of God.[49] What's more, he did so consistently throughout his lifetime and in all of his works.[50] For Spinoza, being a religiously tolerant

---

substantial disparities between the rationality of citizens. These realities, *inter alia*, and the dangers they pose, are best neutralized or mitigated through (rational) religion. Spinoza states, on several occasions that the State is best maintained, and thus that the State will better endure, if instilled with at least the belief in the divine right of the sovereign power and that the sovereign power has no tool more effective than religion with which to instill obedience. Moreover, though unfinished as a result of his untimely death, Spinoza was composing a *Hebrew Grammar*, a requirement of his hermeneutics, outlined in Ch. 7 of his *TTP*, for understanding the words and in turn the minds of the prophets and their audience – something necessary for understanding and thus utilizing the Hebrew Bible. Biographers and historians agree that Spinoza enjoyed talking with his friends and acquaintances about the recent sermons at their respective institutions, hardly the actions of someone with hatred, disdain, or contempt for lived (as opposed to institutional) religion. Bayle (1702, in Wolf (1927), p. 164) discusses Spinoza's reception of his friend's, Jerig Jelles', confession of faith, which he enjoyed and of which he would change nothing. There are also some biographies, of perhaps less than certain veracity, that speak of Spinoza having worked on a Dutch translation of the Pentateuch (cf. Lucas' biography in Wolf (1927), pp. 87, 139; as well as Colerus' in (Pollock (1880), p. 417). Pollock is doubtful of this translation endeavour, and argues that Spinoza's Dutch, by his own admission, Ep. 32, was too unwieldy for him to perform an adequate translation, ignoring the Dutch of the *KV*, which may simply have not been known to him. There is also the curious case of Spinoza's own attempts at Biblical hermeneutics and theology, scattered throughout the *TTP*, and resulting in his own set of universal laws (*TTP*, Ch. 14), that are themselves consistent with a theistic worldview. In the end, these facts together should vitiate against the image of Spinoza as radically and fundamentally against (holy) text based religions. For a more modern take: Cook, *Did Spinoza Lie to His Landlady?* (1986), demonstrates that Spinoza recognized a supreme utilitarian function for scripture and religious practice, highly efficient tools for inculcating civil obedience in those unable to adequately know the benefits of obedience, and in turn, at least potentially and on some level, true piety in those same people.

[47] For only the most obvious example, the title page of the *TTP* reads: *The Theological-Political Tractate: Containing Various Disquisitions, By means of which it is shown not only that Freedom of Philosophizing can be allowed in Preserving Piety and the Peace of the Republic: but also that it is not possible for such Freedom to be upheld except when accompanied by the Peace of the Republic and Piety themselves.* Though the right to philosophize is technically narrower than a more general right to the freedom of thought, Spinoza, to my understanding, argues for the more broad freedom of thought as well, within certain limits. Ch. 20 of the *TTP*, for example, is dedicated to an argument for free speech, *inter alia*.

[48] Smith (2005), p. 6.

[49] Kayser (1977), "Behind the Baroque forms of the geometrical method and the formalistic construction of a logistic system a profound, penetrating, and sincere religiosity [chiefly represented by ILG] is always noticeable," p. 170.

[50] "In general we may say that his whole philosophical development is mirrored in his interpretation of this one motif [namely, ILG]," "From the *Short Treatise* on, the concept of *Amor Dei* [*intellectualis*] remains the pivotal motif of Spinoza's

liberal democrat with a strong commitment to modern science, all with a view to developing and increasing ILG, both within one's self and in society at large, is not only not a contradiction or even a juxtaposition of values, but liberalism, democracy, and (modern) science are all conceived and positively valued only insofar as they are based on and contribute to ILG.[51] It is this seemingly incoherent juxtaposition, the importance of ILG for Spinoza and its lack of appeal or interest for the modern enlightened temperament so dependent on Spinoza, that confounds the modern reader, and frustrates modern interpreters of Spinoza. To put it differently, on the one hand, Spinoza can be said to positively value anything, be it the freedom of thought, tolerance, or democracy, even his determinist pantheist substance monism, cornerstones of and indeed his whole philosophy, only to the extent that it enhances ILG, the highest good, the *summum bonum* of his thought as a whole. Similarly, Spinoza can be said to negatively value anything, be it superstition, oppressive theocracy, or censorship, or the imagination, express targets of his critiques, only to the extent that it limits or otherwise precludes ILG. On the other hand, Spinoza's concept of the intellectual love of God, though heralded occasionally in the past, however wrongly, as the beatific wonder of his mystic vision, and without significant analysis at that, is now barely commented on in the scholarship,[52] has found little resonance in modern Jewish thought or otherwise,[53] and is especially lacking in

---

philosophy," "The idea of Love of God never ceased to occupy the thought of Spinoza," Kayser (1977), pp. 165, 167, 173, respectively. Chapter III, below, should make this abundantly clear.

[51] Spinoza's interdependent understanding of liberalism and religious tolerance, naturalistic science and determinism, as well as ILG qua theological value par excellence flies in the face of modern debates on political theology vis-à-vis liberalism. Cf. the Introduction to *Judaism, Liberalism, and Political Theology* (2013), wherein political theology is defined as a political position derived through and in a critique of liberalism. On Spinoza's understanding, the critique, as inaugurated by Carl Schmidt, would be unnecessary, for Spinoza grounds his liberalism in an openly and obviously theological value, namely ILG. I hope to bring this out more fully at the by the end of the dissertation.

[52] "Generally characterized, then, scholarship on the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*] is at best inadequate; and, at worst, it hardly exists." "Scholarship is found treating the intellectual love of God with piety not rigour, and as a sublime addendum to the *Ethics*, rather than as its intrinsic consummation. For this reason, what is to be added is equally detachable: and scholarship would now fully detach the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*] from the *Ethics*," Maxwell (1990), p. 134-5.

[53] One notable exception is that of Martin Buber, who, despite being occasionally quite critical of Spinoza, actually has much in common with the "heretical" thinker, e.g. the immanence of the Eternal, pantheistic tendencies, love of God, an intuitive immediate relation to God (*Eclipse of God*, pp. 15ff., 58). Unfortunately, this connection has not been fleshed out in the scholarship. Cf. Spinoza missing in Vajda (1957) and Levenson (2016), as discussed above, fn. 11.

treatments of other specific aspects of Spinoza's thought, let alone the myriad aspects of modernity influenced by Spinoza. Thus, it would seem that modernity and scholarship have singled out particularly congenial aspects of Spinoza's thought, aspects they saw fit for their immediate purposes, while the crowning concept and valuated basis of Spinoza's entire system, that which orients and validates all of its various aspects – ILG – has been, always or for the most part, utterly ignored.[54] Though the obstacles are formidable, and the task is daunting, our desire to understand Spinoza, and perhaps, in turn, ourselves, nevertheless demands that we provide some context for and nuance to our understanding of the concept of ILG in Spinoza and more deeply understand its role and function in his thought. It is to these ends, therefore, that the present dissertation intends to contribute, being the respective objectives of Chapter II and III below. In Chapter IV, we will turn to certain issues of central importance in Spinoza's ethical, political, and religious thought, bringing to bear the full weight of the concept of ILG for Spinoza, evidencing its explanatory strength. This is all with a view to making a case for the relevance of Spinoza' concept of ILG for certain contemporary issues the debates on which still draw on Spinoza today.

Despite the earlier mentioned drawback to prioritizing certain ideas or propositions over and against others, counter-intuitively, the above suggests that this study adopts a methodology that is actually in line with this reigning methodology in the scholarship on Spinoza. Since this particular methodology has heretofore precluded our adequate understanding of ILG in Spinoza, I thus propose one significant shift that, I think, Spinoza would be entirely supportive of. Instead of trying to make ILG fold neatly into our reading of other assumedly more central concepts and propositions, or aspects of Spinoza's thought, selected by projecting our modern needs and concerns onto Spinoza, the following study will take ILG as the cardinal concept and orienting value

[54] Nadler (2011), p. xiii, speaking of late 20th c. analytic scholarship on Spinoza, finds that parts EIII-V – "his theory of the passions and his moral philosophy – were seldom discussed at all (and even less frequently taught). This produced a very incomplete and misleading picture of Spinoza's philosophical project."

of Spinoza's thought, as it actually was for Spinoza. It will attempt to do justice to the rest of his thought, to explain the system within which we find the concept of ILG and how that system's chief components are in line with and dependent that concept. The merit and justification behind this shift, and in turn of the proposed methodology and even the dissertation as a whole, is based on the argument begun above that ILG was in fact Spinoza's cardinal concept and value. It is also based on the relative success and merits of the system or reading built thereon, to be found in Chapter IV's application of our more nuanced understanding of ILG onto Spinoza's ethical, political and religious thought. It is a kind of Napoleonic strategy that leaves the exhaustingly trying efforts to achieve a final death blow against those who would continue to ignore or malign the concept of ILG in Spinoza for time to meet out.[55] Upon justifying my methodology and applying it, upon demonstrating the fundamental importance of the concept of ILG for Spinoza, I will conclude the dissertation by briefly discussing the ramifications of the reading of Spinoza's works and thought contained herein for the field of Spinozana, and beyond, especially insofar as it pertains to what I see as an interrelated series of issues: modern debates of political-theology, the idea of an immanental basis for value, as well as the issues of Church and State, and science/philosophy and faith/religion. For now, though, we turn to a review of the literature.

I.B. Literature Review.

The following sub-chapter will consist of a review of the scholarship on the concept of ILG in Spinoza. To give a little sample of what is ahead, Vance Maxwell has an excellent (though scathing and worth quoting at length) summary of the scholarship on ILG up to the late 80's.

[55] Strauss (1935). Though Strauss here critiques the Napoleonic strategy as used by Enlightenment critiques of orthodox religion, he also makes the point that a final assault, to the death, a conclusive demonstrative refutation, would not necessarily have achieved better results. Thus my two pronged approach: system building – a coherent reading of Spinoza that presents and does justice to the major facets of his system – and an argument justifying the erecting of said system, especially as grounded on different principles from others', but not Spinoza's.

"Scholars, whether they desiderate the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*] or not, will grant that the amor [*Dei intellectualis*] is both the consummation and the most neglected aspect of Spinoza's thought… Generally characterized, then, scholarship on the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*] is at best inadequate; and, at worst, it hardly exists… In presenting the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*], books tend to cite propositions from the two groups of propositions demonstrating the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*]: they do not engage with the proofs themselves. Hence, what they yield is summary or paraphrase… Often, their treatments are distressingly slight, hardly more than what an essay on a related topic might provide. Almost always, they lack both rigour and insight, the cost of which is sustained reflection in Spinoza's sense… Individual papers, even those considering Spinoza's epistemology and theory of freedom, give the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*] short shrift, if they mention it at all… Scholarship is found treating the intellectual love of God with piety not rigour, and as a sublime addendum to the *Ethics*, rather than as its intrinsic consummation. For this reason, what is to be added is equally detachable: and scholarship would now fully detach the *amor* [*Dei intellectualis*] from the *Ethics*."[56]

I agree with Maxwell. The following literature review should demonstrate why. I also agree with his estimation of the importance of ILG for Spinoza and echo his call for further study of the concept of ILG in Spinoza. Below, then, I will review some similar scholars, works, and issues as Maxwell has, but will supplement and update his review as well. My present intention is to survey and present the range of positions pertaining to Spinoza's concept of ILG, and some satellite concepts (especially that of the eternity of the mind), so as to provide a more informed understanding of the role, function, and issues surrounding that concept. This will furnish us with a clearer understanding of the philosophical obstacles, to be classified and presented in the next sub-chapter (I.1.C.), facing a coherent understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG, and help guide my analysis of ILG throughout the Spinozan corpus in Chapter III below.

Generally, one can discern four distinct periods in the literature on Spinoza.[57] It is onto this general periodization that the following review will map the history of our scholarly understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG. These periods are each distinguished by particular concerns or biases

---

[56] Maxwell (1990), pp. 132ff.

[57] Pierre-Francois Moreau, *Spinoza et le Spinozisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003), posits nine roughly chronological categories, or "critiques" of Spinoza and Spinozism. My first period corresponds to his first three (Mosaic authorship, Unity of Substance, Cartesians and the Church), my second to his next two (Pantheism (Cabbalism and Controversy)), my third to his sixth (Positivism), with his ninth (Judaism) overlapping my third and fourth periods. I do not take up his seventh (Literary) (Cf. Schwartz (2012)) and Eighth (Psychoanalysis) as they would take us too far afield, and, I would argue, reflect more on the particular litterateur and psychoanalyst, than on Spinoza.

that help to explain their respective understandings of and difficulties with Spinoza's thought, both generally speaking, and with regards to his concept of ILG in particular.

The first period lasted a little over a hundred years, beginning even before his first known official publication, the *TTP* in 1670,[58] going as far back as his excommunication from the budding Amsterdam Jewish community in 1656.[59] This initial period of literature can be characterized by, on the one end, a whole stream of official state and institutional bans, burnings, as well as vitriolic critics leveling venomous charges of immorality, impiety, atheism, and sheer evil upon the deranged mind that would dare concoct such a notion of existence and of the Divine.[60] To quote only the writ of *herem*: the "abominable heresies" of Spinoza.[61] These, however, need not detain us here. On the other end, we have, for example, Pierre Bayle's extensive dictionary entry on Spinoza in his *Historical Critical Dictionary* (1697, 1702), or the biographies of Spinoza penned in those early years, e.g. Jean Maximilien Lucas' (1719) and Johannes Colerus' (1705/6).[62] Indeed a critical though not overly penetrating analysis of Spinoza's life and thought, Bayle's *Dictionary* was translated and reprinted numerous times and was widely read in the following decades across Europe,[63] thus cementing the reputation of Spinoza contained therein. These works, perhaps more understandably due to their respective genres, are again not particularly discerning. A passage from Bayle's dictionary entry on Spinoza sheds a particularly informative light on the scholarship and opinions of Spinoza typical of

---

[58] The *PPC* (1663) antedates the *TTP* (1670), and was technically published, but was more accurately circulated among friends. The *TIE* was never completed.

[59] Curley (1969), pp. vii-ix, ends the first period at around 1780, marking a dramatic shift in attitude to Spinoza, his works, and thought.

[60] Freudenthal (1899), pp. 121-154, has several such declarations, mostly regarding the *TTP*. Section III, pp. 191-238, has several other writings mostly critical of Spinoza. Fritz Bamberger, et al., *Spinoza & Anti-Spinoza Literature: The Printed Literature of Spinozism, 1665-1832* (Cincinnati: HUC Press, 2003). Nadler (2011) has numerous highly charged quotes regarding Spinoza's *TTP* and its doctrines, and discusses the "scandalous treatise" and its reception. Cf. David Hume, *Treatise on Human Nature*, I, Part IV, Sec. 5, for an example outside of Germany of a comparatively more level headed charge of atheism.

[61] Paul Mendes-Flohr, *Jew and the Modern World* (1995), p 57.

[62] For Lucas, see: Wolf (1927). For Colerus, see: Pollock (1880), pp. 391-428.

[63] Bayle's *Dictionary* went through eight French editions in fifty years, and was translated into English (two versions, 1709, 1734-1741) and German (1741-1744) during that time as well. For more on the history of this important book, see: Pierre Bayle, *Historical and Critical Dictionary: Selections* , trans. by. Richard H. Popkin (Hackett Publishing Company: 1991).

the period:

> "Very few people are suspected of adhering to his doctrine; and among those who are so suspected, there are few who have studied it; and among these there are few who have grasped it, and who have not been repelled by the obstacles and impenetrable abstractions which they encounter therein. But so it is: *prima facie* all are Spinozists who have no religion, and who make no great secret of it."[64]

Voltaire (1694 –1778) would have agreed, stating that "as for Spinoza, everybody talks of him and nobody reads him," and, adding his own humourous twist, continues with, "If illustrious adversaries may contribute in some way to the glory of an author, one sees that no man has ever been honored with more respectable enemies."[65] Therefore, likely in large part because of the unanimous, abundant, and severe, though by no means informed or insightful, opprobrium of Spinoza's critics, including even his very excommunication,[66] which explicitly forbade reading or possessing any of his works, let alone association with him, scholarship of this early period "reveal[s] little true understanding of Spinoza's meaning," having "viewed [Spinoza] in a one-sided and inaccurate manner."[67] Generally speaking, then, the literature of this initial period negatively agrees as to the legitimacy and worthiness of a study of Spinoza and his thought. The scholarship agrees further in that it pays little to no attention to his concept of ILG, let alone its role and function in his early works, his mature philosophy and metaphysics, as well as his ethical, political, and religious thought. If considered or even mentioned explicitly, though certainly not critically analyzed, ILG, along with his materialism and pantheism, is dismissed as a Kabbalistic mystic vestige, a holdover of his latent Judaism which Spinoza could not quite ever fully overcome.[68] Leibniz (1646-1716), however, presents us with a unique case. Someone who doggedly pursued copies of Spinoza's work and an

---

[64] Bayle (1702), in Wolf (1927), p. 163.
[65] Voltaire, "Les Systèmes" in *Oeuvres Complètes de Voltaire*, Vol. X (Paris, 1877), p. 171, translated by Feuer (1958), pp. 258, 308.
[66] Schwartz (2012), pp. 18-20.
[67] Bell (1984), pp. 16 & 22, respectively.
[68] For more on the history of the scholarly understanding of Spinoza's, and his concept of ILG's, relationship to Jewish thought, see: Chapter II, below.

understanding of it, we have perhaps the first esoteric reading of Spinoza and his concept of ILG. Frustrated by much of Spinoza's philosophy, including its resulting, and supposedly inconsistent, conception of the eternity of the mind, Leibniz finds that "what Spinoza says about the intellectual love of God is only a sop to the masses,"[69] thereby deeming the concept of ILG ultimately irrelevant for an understanding of Spinoza's true philosophy. Taking ILG seriously, however, there is thus little to learn about it from this initial period. What was said of Spinoza therein reflects more on the critics than on Spinoza. This first period ended when F.H. Jacobi declared G.E. Lessing, a prominent and beloved thinker and playwright, the mouthpiece and embodiment of Enlightenment values in German society, to have been a crypto-Spinozist. This was a shocking and, especially for the time, counter-intuitive charge. For, how could so noble and truly German a person as Lessing espouse so hideous a philosophy as Spinoza's – a philosophy, according to Jacobi and the critics of the Enlightenment, tantamount to fatalism, atheism, and nihilism? The resulting fray sparked the famous *Pantheismusstreit* or Pantheism Controversies of the mid-late 1780's in Germany, which, having quickly developed past the mere question of the heart, image, and legacy of Lessing, spread beyond Prussian borders, and greatly renewed interest in Spinoza by the end of the century.[70]

The second period in the scholarship on Spinoza extends from the mid 1780's to around the mid-late-19th century, ending with the shadow of Hegel. A consequence of the exceedingly public Pantheism Controversies, heated debates on the role of reason – Enlightenment reason, an understanding of existence that saw everything as in principle open to rational scientific analysis and explanation through a mechanistic conception of cause and effect – and, correspondingly, the role

---

[69] Leibniz, *Philosophical Essays*, p. 281.

[70] For Spinoza in the late 18th century, and the kind of renaissance of interest inspired by the *Pantheismusstreit* after the initial flurry of negative responses to his writings, see the relevant works of Moses Mendelssohn and F.H. Jacobi, and several other important thinkers and figures of the time, discussed in Vallee (1988) & Beiser (1987), especially pp. 44-108. Also, cf.: fn. 27, above. For a more recent discussion of the consequences of this "reception" of Spinoza, see: Ursula Goldenbaum, "Pantheismusstreit - Milestone or Stumbling Block in the German Reception of Spinoza," in *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary* (Brill Academic Publishers, 2011).

of religion, in human life and society spread throughout Germany and Western Europe. Accurate to his word or not, representative of the hardline rationalist Enlightenment position in these debates was Spinoza.[71] Specifically, his rationalist, determinist, pantheist metaphysics demonstrated so aptly and consistently, geometrically, in the *Ethics* , as well as his cogent and forceful arguments on behalf of democracy, free speech, and religious tolerance in the *TTP*, were appropriated both for and against the Enlightenment cause. As a result of the entire hubbub, people began to actually read Spinoza, and not just echo his critics. For example, Herder (1744-1803) was inspired to write what one scholar finds to be the first sustained and systematic reading of Spinoza's work, his *God, Some Conversations* (1787).[72] Pushing back against those critical of the Enlightenment project, certain readers of Spinoza thus managed to get past the strict rationalism, materialism, determinism, and pantheism of the early parts of the *Ethics* and read through to the latter parts of the work. In turn, the "religious nucleus of his philosophy was revealed,"[73] and he came to be venerated by the German Romantics. Spinoza's concept of God or Nature, ILG, and its resulting conception of the eternity of the mind, regardless of its consistency with earlier propositions of the *Ethics*, let alone its role in his ethical, political, and (critical) religious thought, was heralded for having achieved reconciliation if not fusion of rationalism and mysticism, of reason and religion. Thus, in this second period,[74] ILG is either proclaimed as Spinoza's rationally grounded mystic vision of the one and all (*hen kai pan*), as supposed proof that pure reason need not necessarily preclude religion, piety, and knowledge of God, but can in fact be the sole basis for them. Or, it is derided yet again as a vestige

---

[71] Israel (2001), Ch. 8, p. 159, "Spinoza, then, emerged as the supreme philosophical bogeyman of Early Enlightenment Europe."
[72] Bell, (1984 (1980 Diss.)).
[73] Kayser (1977), p. 173.
[74] Hermann Timm, "Amor Dei Intelletualis" in *Neue Hefte fur Philosophie*, No. 12, 1977, pp. 64-91 (German), barely citing EV at all, primarily discusses the reception of Spinoza's concept of ILG in Germany in the late 18th c. and into the decades following.

of or unfortunate relapse to his early Kabbalistic (read: Jewish) indoctrination.[75] Ultimately, however, and unfortunately, "they are content to give some abridgment or paraphrase of Spinoza's argument which in truth explains nothing."[76]

After Hegel, the resultant rise to prominence of the concept of history, and the emergence of *Wissenschaft des Judentums / Religionen* (the historico-socio-scientific study of Judaism / religions), however, the study of Spinoza was transformed. No longer is Spinoza an arch rationalist cum atheist, or the "God intoxicated man"[77] of Novalis, "most theistic" or even "most Christian" as per Goethe,[78] and the German Romantics. Rather, in the third period, Spinoza becomes a legitimate subject of study in his own right. First, merely as the inspirational source for Hegel, his epigones and their critics, as the philosophy by which all true philosophy, as Hegel declared,[79] must be judged. Then, by the early 20th c., after sustained engagement as a minor (read: Jewish) source for thinkers like Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, Marx, and Nietzsche,[80] and perhaps as a result of these recent varied researches into the many tendrils of his influence, Spinoza was at long last seen for what he was: a substantial watershed thinker in the history of philosophy and thus a truly worthy subject of study on his own terms. It is here, then, with Spinoza finally understood as one of the great minds of

---

[75] Though not specifically speaking of Spinoza's concept of ILG, Solomon Maimon, in his autobiography of 1793, states that "In fact, Cabbalah is nothing but expanded Spinozism." Taken from the English version: *Solomon Maimon: An Autobiography*, trans. by J. Clark Murray (Illinois: First Illinois Paparback, 2001), p. 105.

Again, for more on the history of the scholarly understanding of Spinoza's, and his concept of ILG's, relationship to Jewish thought, see: Chapter II, below.

[76] Pollock (1880), p. 279. Pollock, in explanation, continues: "they are forced to say either that Spinoza did not clearly know his own meaning, or that he did not succeed in saying what he meant, or that he deliberately said things he did not mean: none of which suppositions can be entertained by any serious and impartial reader of the 'Ethics' except as a desperate remedy," p. 280. Sadly, this weak rhetoric derided by Pollock over 125 years ago still saturates the scholarship on ILG even today.

[77] "Fragmente der letzten Jahre" in Paul Kluckhohn (ed.), *Novalis Schriften* (Leipzig, 1928), Vol. III, p. 253: "*Gott-trunkener Mensch.*"

[78] "*Theissimus*" and even "*Christianissimus*" in a letter to Jacobi.

[79] "…Thought must begin by placing itself at the standpoint of Spinozism; to be a follower of Spinoza is the essential commencement of all Philosophy" and "The fact is that Spinoza is made a testing-point in modern philosophy, so that it may really be said: You are either a Spinozist or not a philosopher at all…" in *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* (1896), Vol. 3, Ch. I, pp. 257, 283.

[80] Fns. 23-27 above.

human history, where we may delve deeper in our review. This third period can arguably be extended through WWII, where, building upon the extensive archival work, as well as the edited manuscripts and translations developed by the diligent work of the purveyors of the *Wissenschaft des Judentum* from within Germany, later scholars, both within Germany and beyond, produced several substantial studies on Spinoza including the pioneering works of Joel,[81] Freudenthal,[82] Gebhardt later,[83] and especially that of Wolfson,[84] foundational even now. For our purposes, their main contribution consists in arguing for the relevance of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition for a deeper understanding of Spinoza's thought generally and ILG specifically. Considering the focus of Chapter II, they, and several other relevant scholars, will be taken up more fully there. For now, one can safely say that their researches, and specifically their focus on Spinoza's medieval Jewish philosophical sources, when recognized and consulted, significantly propelled the works of the next generations and continue to inform scholars today. Before moving on to the fourth period, however, it is to other representative scholarship of this third period, works by the likes of Pollock, Caird, and Joachim, just to name the more comprehensive authors, to which we now turn.

Perhaps the first systematic engagement of the life, corpus, and philosophy of Spinoza in English, Sir Frederick Pollock's *Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy* (1880), is skeptical but not outright dismissive of the degree to which Joel claimed Spinoza to have been influenced by the Jewish

---

[81] Manuel Joel, *Spinoza's Theologisch-Politischer Traktat auf seine Quellen gepruft* (Breslau: Schletter'sche Buchhandlung, 1870). Ibid., *Zur Genesis Der Lehre Spinoza's Mit Besonder Berucksichtigung Des Kurzen Traktatis "Von Gott, Dem Menschen Und Dessen Gluckseligkeit"* (Breslau: Jewish Theological Seminar, 1871). Also of relevance: Ibid., *Don Chasdai Creskas' Religionsphilosophische Lehren in Ihrem Geschichtlichen Einflusse Dargestellt* (Breslau: Schletter'sche Buchhandlung, 1866). Joel here discusses the ideas of Spinoza on several occasions (pp. 9f, 22f, 37ff, 44, 54ff), though mostly in the notes, and focuses on the influence of Crescas on Spinoza's conception of the infinite and his concept of ILG, specifically the idea that God loves.

[82] Jacob Freudenthal, *Die Lebensgeschichte Spinoza's in Quellenschriften, Urkunden und Nichtamtlichen Nachrichten* (Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Comp, 1899). Ibid., *Spinoza, leben und lehre* (Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1927).

[83] Carl Gebhardt, *Spinozas Abhandlung über die Verbesserung des Verstandes : eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Heidelberg : C. Winter, 1905). Ibid., *Spinoza, Lebensbeschreibungen und Gespräche* (Leipzig : F. Meiner, 1914). Ibid., "Spinoza und der Platonismus" in *Chronicon Spinozanum*, Vol. 1, 1921, pp. 178-234. Spinoza, *Opera*, Carl Gebhardt (ed.), 4 Vols. (Berlin: 1925). Also of interest: Carl Gebhardt, *Leone Ebreo, Dialoghi d'Amore* (Heidelberg: 1929).

[84] Harry Austryn Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza: Unfolding the Latent Process of His Reasoning* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934).

philosophical tradition.[85] Pollock, rather, aligns Spinoza more with the Stoics in the end.[86] Regarding ILG, Pollock refuses to accept that Spinoza's concept of ILG is either bunk or duplicitous.[87] However, Pollock finds ILG to be not so much an emotion, not recognizing ILG as an affect, but rather a kind of Stoic acceptance. He also disconnects the eternal aspect of ILG from its superlative *active* affective aspect for the sake of the coherence of his interpretation of the emotions.[88] Taking all rational knowledge for Spinoza to be knowledge "*sub specie aeternitatis*,"[89] Pollock understands from the "mystic temper in his expressions"[90] and the "poetic glow"[91] of the passages demonstrating ILG that eternal life for Spinoza is not continuous, but rather a manner of existence, realized now.[92] In the end, however, though Pollock is sincere in his attempt to make sense of the concept, he is duly though overly concerned with the temporal difficulties of ILG, and spends almost no space discussing the ethical, political, or religious ramifications of the concept, over and above the Stoic equanimity attained through it. Even then, ILG is mentioned exceedingly briefly.

In grappling with the moral consequences of Spinoza's determinism, yet another of the "conflicting tendencies"[93] in Spinoza that a consideration of his sources is unlikely to resolve,[94] John Caird's *Spinoza* (1888) posits that necessity and freedom need not be predicated of the same subject at the same time,[95] failing to understand Spinoza's intention to in fact identify the two in a single subject (Substance, and, ideally, all modes) at the same time. Introducing a completely foreign notion

---

[85] Sir Frederick Pollock, *Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy* (London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1880), pp. 101-122, 286-88.
[86] Pollock (1880), p. 302.
[87] Pollock (1880), pp. 291-2.
[88] Pollock (1880), p. 280. Since we have yet to clarify what these two aspects are, in brief , the eternal aspect is the eternity of the mind that ILG secures and the active aspect is, simply, the love and joy felt in attaining to said eternity.
[89] Pollock (1880), p. 294
[90] Pollock (1880), p. 298.
[91] Pollock (1880), p. 303
[92] Pollock (1880), p. 286, 291
[93] John Caird, *Spinoza* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1888), p. 3.
[94] Caird (1888), pp. 36ff. At best such endeavours may disclose the "predisposing impulse" (p. 39.)
[95] Caird (1888), pp. 259ff.

of the will into his discussion of reason in Spinoza,[96] Caird agrees with Pollock, understanding that the passionless existence attained to in ILG, "the immortality which is sanctioned by Spinoza's principles is not a quantitative but a qualitative endowment – not existence of indefinite time, but the quality of being above time. It is an immortality, therefore, which may be attained here and now."[97] Curiously, Caird attempts to develop a Spinozistic theory of the pre-existence of consciousness on his route to declaring that "the last word of Spinoza's philosophy seems to be the contradiction of the first. Not only does he often fluctuate between principles radically irreconcilable, but he seems to reassert at the close of his speculations what he denied at the beginning."[98]

In *A Study of the Ethics of Spinoza* (1901), H.H. Joachim is keen to recognize that earlier dismissive charges of mysticism in the scholarship on ILG are a result of their prioritization of (their reading of) earlier propositions in the *Ethics*.[99] For Joachim, as for Spinoza, duration is the problem, the illusion, the imaginative error.[100] Regarding the eternity of the mind, Joachim finds the use of temporal language and terminology in the latter parts of the *Ethics* to be a "momentary slip"[101] from Spinoza's geometric degree of precision.[102] Following Pollock,[103] Joachim is explicit in denying any kind of future eternity after this life.[104] When rationally understood as an eternally necessary yet finite affection of Substance, any mode, the interdependent finite ratio of motion and rest/idea in the infinite matrix of cause and effect, is an eternal fact. When we comprehend this of ourselves via the

---

96 Caird (1888), p. 285, et passim.
97 Caird (1888), pp. 284-6, 291.
98 Caird (1888), p. 303. Caird here is speaking of ILG's eternity of the mind at the end of the *Ethics* and the metaphysics of strict determinism of EI, broadly speaking, and perhaps even the parallelism of EIIp7, which isn't quite at the beginning, though it is hinted at already in EID6.
99 Harold H. Joachim, *A Study of the Ethics of Spinoza* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), p. 233 n. 1.
100 Joachim (1901), p. 226-7.
101 Joachim (1901), p. 296.
102 Joachim (1901), p. 294-8. Specifically, Joachim takes "this present life" and the use of the word "remains" in EVp20S, as well as his use of the concept of duration generally to task.
103 Joachim (1901), p. 295 n. 4.
104 Joachim (1901), p. 295.

second and third forms of knowledge, our ideas of ourselves are recognized for what they are, one with, identical to, and thus equally eternal to, the ideas of ourselves contained in the infinite idea of God.[105] In the end, really only summarizing ILG, Joachim states that "what was true of our perfect self-realization as complete 'knowledge,' is true of it as ' love' of God. We love God with a love which is eternal, because our love of God is God loving himself in us: just as we know God under the form of eternity, because our understanding of God is God thinking himself in (or as) us. The mind, in its knowledge of God, is a part of God's complete knowledge of himself. And the mind, in its love of God, is a part of the complete love of God for himself. This ' constant and eternal love of God, which is God's love of men,' is our ' salvation,' 'felicity,' or ' freedom.' It is the 'peace of mind,' which the Scriptures have rightly called 'The Glory of God.'"[106] Sadly, these lines, and other similar cursory passages,[107] though they recognize the identity of ILG, salvation, and freedom for Spinoza, conclude the final section of his work, which itself is heavily preoccupied with only the *Ethics*. Joachim does little else to trace the function of ILG throughout Spinoza's thought, or even back through the *Ethics*.

The understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG presented above is one that is almost completely blindingly obsessed with the resulting eternity of the mind. This myopia is more or less maintained by the many scholars of this third period, English,[108] French,[109] German,[110] Spanish,[111]

---

[105] Joachim (1901), p. 305-6.
[106] Joachim (1901), p. 305-6.
[107] For example: "Spinoza's conception of '*scientia intuitiva*' is unintelligible apart from his conception of the 'Freedom,' 'Happiness,' or 'Salvation' of man, i.e. man's attainment of the practical ideal. Philosophy in fact, in its highest form, is to Spinoza at the same time and essentially the noblest form of human life: the life of religion," Joachim (1901), p. 181.
[108] Stuart Hampshire's popular *Spinoza* (London, 1951) spends two pages discussing intellectual love, describing it as the rare experience of eternal intellectual union. In his "Spinoza's Theory of Human Freedom" in *The Monist* 55, no. 4 (1971): pp. 554–566, Hampshire again skips discussion of love and relegates eternity of the mind to this life, intermittently (p. 564). Intermittent eternity being a delightful yet absurd oxymoron. David Bidney, *The Psychology and Ethics of Spinoza: A Study in the History and Logic of Ideas* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940), using the un-Spinozistic language of will (pp. 164, 167, et passim), and expressing a puritan shock at Spinoza's inability to realize the essential incompatibility of sensual and intellectual love (p. 172), understands union with and intellectual love of God as intending an increased focus on God, (p. 162ff), and finds Spinoza's doctrine of immortality to be mystical and requiring a transcendental object (p. 178). His earlier "Value and Reality in the Metaphysics of Spinoza" in *The Philosophical Review*,

and continues even today.[112] Interestingly, and in line with the general argument of my dissertation, those works not particularly concerned with a historical, comparative analysis of Spinoza's concept

---

Vol. 45, No. 3 (May 1936), pp. 229-244, makes no mention of ILG. Leon Roth, *Spinoza* (London, 1929), building off his 1924 work *Spinoza, Descartes, and Maimonides* (1924), though he finds ILG "to be found in all his works" and provides a brief trace of its surprisingly minor development (p. 140-48), argues that eternity of the mind represents not so much a quantity as a quality of existence (p. 153). H.F. Hallett, *Aeternitas: A Spinozistic Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), an expanded version of "Spinoza's Conception of Eternity," *Mind*, New Series, 37, no. 147 (July 1928): 283–303, makes almost no mention of intellectual love, finding ILG not to depend on reason, though he does quote the relevant propositions from EV at length, with no analysis, in order to reinforce his interpretation of his part/ whole understanding of modes and substance (p. 145ff & 208ff). His *Benedict de Spinoza: The Elements of His Philosophy* (London: 1957), pp. 159-61, doesn't find ILG to be an affect, but rather to depend epistemically on the immanence of its object in the self. George Stuart Fullerton, *On Spinozistic Immortality* (Boston, MA.: Ginn & Co., 1899), somehow avoiding any major discussions of love, finds the eternity of the mind to be "not in harmony with those teachings [of the earlier parts of the *Ethics*]" (p. 115), that Spinoza's conception of ILG in the *Ethics* is "highly misleading" (p. 140), has little in common with that put forth in the TIE, and is inconsistent with his actual doctrine (pp. 141ff.). A. E. Taylor, "Spinoza's Conception of Immortality," *Mind*, 5, No. 18, New Series (April 1896), pp. 145-166, is highly critical and also focuses on the question of eternity. James Martineau, *A Study of Spinoza* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895) gives almost no analysis. He finds intellectual love to depend on intuition, not reason (p. 274), and quotes the relevant propositions of EV at length (p. 294ff) but to then discuss the (personal) eternity of the mind.

[109] Victor Brochard, "L'Eternite des Ames dans la Philosophie de Spinoza" in *Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale*, Vol. 9, No. 6 (Nov. 1901), pp. 688-99, concerned to defend a personal immortality in Spinoza, finds that "in [Spinoza's] philosophy the modes are Aristotelian, the attributes Cartesian, and substance Jewish" (p. 697, translation mine), and the idea of "eternally distinct" modes to be entirely Plotinian (p. 698). Unfortunately, Brochard introduces a Cartesian will into his analysis of Spinoza (p. 698), rendering the already short piece rather unhelpful. P. Malapert, "L'Amour Intellectuel de Dieu" in *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Etranger* (Paris: Presses Univeritaires de France, 1888), pp. 245-58, divides the object of reason and intuition between modes and Substance, and maintains both in ILG as ideals, one practical the other purely ideal, reflecting the inner tension of Spinoza between degrees of perfection and ideal metaphysical perfection. "He speaks here not of a prolongation, of a continuation of our existence, but rather of a particular mode of being," (p. 255, translation mine), though the article also claims ILG to have no beginning (p. 256).

[110] C. Lulmann, *Ueber den Begriff amor dei intellectualis bei Spinoza* (Jena: 1884), a dissertation of 46 pages, spends well over half the work developing an understanding of the knowledge of God for Spinoza, an admittedly important part of ILG, but also indicative of his priorities. Lulmann has difficulty understanding joy as resulting from God's love (pp. 22ff.), and, despite recognizing ILG as the highest ideal earlier on, nevertheless posits either that "there is something better than the amor dei intellectualis" or that it is impossible (p. 23, translation mine). Regarding the eternity of the mind, it is a "thoroughgoing contradiction" (p. 34, translation mine). In the end, Lulmann also draws out and separates the individual mystical and rational scientific aspects of ILG, finding ILG to be "by no means a rationalistic or naturalistic concept" and "by no means always in agreement with the laws of rational knowledge" (p. 36, translation mine). Adolf Dyroff, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Lehre Spinozas vom Amor Dei intellectualis" in *Archiv fur Geschichte de Philosophie*, Vol. 31, 1918, pp. 1-28, critical of Lulmann, is ultimately more constructive with his review, and less critical of Spinoza as well, though he does use the language of God's will and intention (p. 8, et passim) in his analysis. However, his review of the reception of Spinoza's concept of ILG of the last century is worth noting. M. Grunwald, "Judische Mystik" in *Jahrbuch fur Judische Volksunde* (1923), pp. 371-393, places Spinoza's concept of ILG firmly within the Jewish mystical tradition, but does little else to develop our understanding of the concept within Spinoza's thought.

[111] Leon Dujovne, *Spinoza: Su Vida, Su Epoca, Su Obra, Su Influencia* , 3 Vols. (Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filosofia de la Facultad de Filosofia y Letra, 1941). After favourably reviewing the scholarship on the question of Spinoza's medieval Jewish philosophical sources in Vol. II, and generally heavily dependent on Wolfson, Dujovne, after deferring the question of eternity for later (III, p. 240), offers a reading of ILG that is heavily informed by his reading of the KV, describing it as the "most constant of the emotions" (III, p. 240, translation mine), and thus, once again, of this life. In the end, Dujovne considers the eternity of the mind to be the "mystic element of his doctrine" (III, p. 245, translation mine).

[112] To be discussed below immediately following the discussion of this third period.

of ILG or with Spinoza's medieval Jewish philosophical sources, are duly frustrated with Spinoza's concept of ILG and the resulting eternity of the mind, and generally interpret the concept of ILG as intending merely some kind of felicitous attainment in and of our duration. They go little further in their explications of the role and function of ILG in Spinoza's works and thought, despite generally at least recognizing it as an important concept and even an ideal (but almost never *the* ideal). It would seem then that, happy to investigate what it was the German Romantics of the previous period were so smitten with, scholarship of the third period became increasingly preoccupied with and confused by the question of the eternity of the mind. Focused on its consistency with earlier propositions and concepts in Spinoza's *Ethics*, and its consistency with their own (often Christian) expectations of a personal immortality, scholarship generally failed to take notice of the amount of work done by ILG in and throughout the *Ethics*, as well as the rest of Spinoza's corpus, and not just in the final resulting conception of immortality or the eternity of the mind. Frustrated by its seeming incoherence, scholars sought elsewhere to explain what could only be so through ILG, compounding their confusions and assuring that of later generations were they to deign to return to the concept of ILG or those that depend, derive, or are further delimited from it. This third period in the scholarship thus serves to indicate and develop our understanding of certain problems facing the concept of ILG in Spinoza, most especially that of the resulting eternity of the mind, but does little to solve them, and even less to better our understanding of ILG itself, in all its many facets in and throughout Spinoza's thought and corpus.

Before moving on to the fourth and final period, however, a short and unique piece by Morris R. Cohen needs to be mentioned. In it,[113] Cohen argues on behalf of Spinoza's concept of ILG, "that most of the traditional difficulties [regarding ILG] have arisen from trying to harmonize

[113] Morris R. Cohen, "Amor Dei Intellectualis" in *Chronicon Spinozanum*, Vol. 3, 1923, pp. 3-19.

Spinoza with the expositor's own views,"[114] that it can help modern life, and that it is essential to reconciling naturalism and materialism with the piety of the spiritual life.[115] Declaring that "overemphasis on the importance of time is the root of nearly all the distinctive fallacies of modernism" insofar as "the false elevation of time, which is the necessary condition or aspect of all existent things, [has been turned] into the sufficient condition for all meanings,"[116] Cohen turns to Spinoza's concept of ILG for help. If such a concept of love as we find in Spinoza is rationally feasible, explains Cohen, then love must entail some norm that will enable us to discriminate that which is admirable, namely: the good, from what is not. This is exactly what, according to Cohen, ILG effects.[117] For, it is only through an adequate understanding of the world at any single time as determined thus from eternity that we can take up the rational effort to improve it. Therefore, "the essence of the meaning of intellectual love of God is the adequate idea or ideals of a complete intuition or insight into the system of nature to which a study of the implication of existing things and especially of our own emotions may lead us."[118] It is greater than a mere knowledge of isolated details, of brute science, and knowledge of nature. It is an edifying union of our mood and nature obtained by self-knowledge.[119] When discussing the mystical element in Spinoza,[120] Cohen finds in it a way to transcend the essential limitation of rational apprehension as it provides the immediate element in rational apprehension. It is thus certainly not counter or contrary to rationalism, but a natural complement. Mindful of the "difficulties and even inconsistencies"[121] of the Spinozistic system, Cohen's unfortunately brief investigation is nevertheless able to see ILG for the valuated basis and ideal in the philosophy of Spinoza that it really is. Sadly, Cohen here goes little further than

[114] Cohen (1923), p. 12.
[115] Cohen (1923), p. 4.
[116]Cohen (1923), p. 9.
[117] Cohen (1923), p. 10.
[118] Cohen (1923), p. 14/5.
[119] Cohen (1923), p. 16.
[120] Cohen (1923), p. 14.
[121] Cohen (1923), p. 12.

justifying his plea for a serious consideration of the concept of ILG. A plea left unanswered for too long.

In part a result of the rise of analytic philosophy and the philosophy of mind in the West (with Descartes as a pivotal figure), as well as of psychology and the neuro-scientific study of the human mind, all of which reached a kind of saturation, if you will, in the nineteen-seventies, modern scholarship experienced a resurgence of interest in Spinoza towards the end of the 20th century, a fourth period.[122] Originally, and in part due to the pioneering work of Edwin Curley, the focus was almost exclusively metaphysical. However, in the last twenty years or so,[123] there has been a flurry of interest in Spinoza's political works and thought as well, though only recently have they been taken seriously as a source for Spinoza's metaphysics.[124] Today, though most scholars on either side of the metaphysical – political divide in Spinoza scholarship do visit the other, there are still those who would wish that Spinoza had never written the *TTP* for the sake of their interpretation of the *Ethics*, or who completely ignore the *Ethics* for the sake of their interpretation of the *TTP*.[125] The more comprehensive systematism of the previous period has given way to exceedingly focused and precise studies of the various aspects and concepts, even single propositions, of Spinoza's thought, though the concept of ILG, or its propositions, remain missing. Thus, one can find ILG merely mentioned in articles treating of: the emotions, especially joy (*laeititia*, *gaudium*); the intuition, by its various names; eternity, eternity of the mind, and immortality; and a few others. But, it is rarely if ever the

---

[122] In France, this resurgence can be explained by the rise of structuralism in the 50's and 60's, and certain foundational works on Spinoza that resulted in the late 60's. Cf. "Preface" in Montag and Stolze (eds.), *The New Spinoza* (1997), for a brief overview of the Francophone / continental philosophical engagement with Spinoza of the late 20th c.

[123] This extends further back in France.

[124] Melamed persuasively makes just such a case for the *TTP*, and in fact follows up on the argument, in "The Metaphysics of the *Theological-Political Treatise*" in *Spinoza's Theological Political Treatise: A Critical Guide*, eds. Melamed & Rosenthal (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 128-142.

[125] Bennet's claim, early in his study, that "I do not find [the *TTP*] helpful in understanding the *Ethics*" (1984, p. 7), is only one of the more explicit annunciations of this view. Nadler (2005, p. 202, n. 2), comments that "many tend to make only a half-hearted effort to relate [Spinoza's two key works, the *Ethics* and the *TTP*], content to point out 'parallels' and 'consistency' or use isolated claims from one to illuminate isolated claims from the other."

focus or critically analyzed; there are no book length treatments of the concept of ILG in Spinoza, and certainly no treatments of ILG, book length or otherwise, that also treat of its relation to his ethical, political, and religious thought in a systematic manner.[126] In this fourth and final period the question of the eternity of the mind, over and above ILG itself, still remains front and center. Therefore, in light of Curley's warning that "to ignore the moral convictions that underlay the metaphysics is to leave out of account what mattered most to Spinoza,"[127] it seems this fourth period continues to overlook the cardinal concept, value, and ideal in Spinoza's philosophy.

To begin our review of the fourth period, we turn to Bruder's 1970 dissertation.[128] Perhaps the only full length treatment of ILG of this final period, or any period for that matter, it too falls short of a systematic examination of the concept of ILG. Bruder is exceedingly concerned with the unitive aspect of ILG, arguing on several occasions that "blessedness is the realized unity with God,"[129] that "intuition makes God immediate to man and this unity is love,"[130] or that "this unity in act is the love in which God loves himself… [and that] the power of man is the love of God for himself."[131] Therefore, "the act [of ILG] as a unification of a plurality is love,"[132] raises human love to eternity, and through it "man has become God in the very love wherein God enacts himself"[133] for "the one is God in act…the unity of love is the one act of God."[134] There is no real discussion of the concept of ILG beyond the unitive aspect of the metaphysics of the *Ethics*, no engagement of ILG as a political or religious ideal. Moreover, as the above quotations show, the analysis, even of

---

126 Kenneth John Bruder's 1970 dissertation, *Baruch Spinoza's Logic of the One or One Act of Love*, may be the only book length exception, but for a reason to be immediately discussed.
127 Curley (1969), p. 155.
128 Kenneth John Bruder, *Barush Spinoza's Logic of the One or One Act of Love* (Bamberg: Difo-Drcuk SChmacht, 1970) (Diss., Freiburg University). Maxwell (1990), pp. 135-8, covers several works from the 1950s and 60s, none of which would significantly contribute to our understanding of ILG itself.
129 Bruder (1970), p. 235.
130 Bruder (1970), p. 236.
131 Bruder (1970), p. 260. For similar statements, Cf. pp. 242, 276, 281, 286,
132 Bruder (1970), p. 296.
133 Bruder (1970), p. 308.
134 Bruder (1970), p. 309.

the metaphysical aspect, is fairly one-sided, being as concerned with the unitive aspect of ILG as it is.

Harris' 1971 work on "Spinoza's Theory of Human Immortality" begins promisingly, stating that regarding Spinoza's theory of human immortality, "there is no actual inconsistency and that the conflicts in his doctrines are only apparent."[135] After reviewing Joachim's solutions to the problem of immortality in Spinoza, and finding it wanting, Harris proposes the fact that human adequate ideas are not static pictures or replicas of existence, but incredibly complex amalgamations of numerous ideas as the basis of his solution.[136] As a result, consciousness is understood to be self-transcending. In its distinguishing itself from the background of the infinite series of finite modes, consciousness sets itself in a context.[137] "The human mind, therefore, as the idea of the body, embraces within its consciousness all the affects of the body and all its relations with the rest of the world, and so is all-inclusive even in its passions and its confused ideas… [and] its conatus is towards actions and so impels it to develop…towards the perfection of its own being in the intellectual love of God."[138] The body, on the other hand, is understood as a "vehicle of God's own self-revelation in and through the mind of man."[139] In the end, Harris finds time and space, to be tools of thought, not determinative of it, to be partial features of substance, but of no ultimate significance;[140] that infinite reality has little to do with extended duration; and that intuitive knowledge doesn't maintain the body, but rather knows its place in nature, an eternal fact, and acts accordingly.[141] With its exclusive focus on the problem of immortality, precisely the above claim, *inter alia*, that ILG and its resulting eternity of the mind ideally inform our actions to act in

---

135 Errol Harris, "Spinoza's Theory of Human Immortality" in *The Monist*, Vol. 55, No. 4, Oct., 1971, p. 668.
136 Harris (1971), p. 678.
137 Harris (1971), p. 679.
138 Harris (1971), p. 680.
139 Harris (1971), p. 681.
140 Harris (1971), p. 683/4
141 Harris (1971), p. 685.

accordance with reality, is left unexplained.

With a specific piece by Rice in mind, we work through several earlier papers of Rice's that develop arguments put to use in the work of ultimate relevance. In a paper on individuation, there is the argument that identity is a matter of degree – the degree of power, reality, or causal efficaciousness that we attain to.[142] In a paper on the conatus, there is the argument that time or duration, especially with regards to the causal efficaciousness of a mode, stands firmly against a strong reading of Spinoza's parallelism.[143] Physical effects occur in time. These same effects, paralleled in order and relation under the attribute of thought, do not, however, take place in time.[144] Turning to the conatus specifically, Rice finds Spinoza's conception of it to be highly teleological, "reintroducing it [teleology] through the back door,"[145] and concluding that "perhaps ultimately there is a sense in which the conception of human striving and interaction can be called teleological; and, if it arises out of his conception of universal agency, perhaps Spinoza was indeed the first genuine teleologist. Given the fact that much of contemporary philosophy still moves under the notion of will as autonomous, free, or independent (what Spinoza would call a 'microcosmic' view), it may well be that he was also the last."[146] These last two points are especially poignant in support of my argument against the prioritization of earlier concepts and propositions. For, as the above shows, both parallelism and the critique of teleology, two fairly early concepts and arguments in the *Ethics*,[147] are developed and reworked by Spinoza later in the text, at least according to Rice. Regarding ILG specifically, a paper by Rice argues that when viewed as a return to EIIp20-21, propositions detailing

---

[142] Lee C. Rice, "Spinoza on Individuation" in *The Monist*, Vol. 55, No. 4, Oct. 1971, p. 656. Individuation here depends on a repeatedly caused effect resulting in a "determinate relation" between cause and effect (p. 648/9).
[143] This point is followed up by Rice in "Paradoxes of Parallelism in Spinoza" in *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 48 (January 1999), pp. 37-54, esp. p. 50 for the idea that attributes must be special in kind.
[144] Lee C. Rice, "Emotion, Appetition, and Conatus in Spinoza" in *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, No. 119-20 (1/2), 1977, pp. 106ff.
[145] Rice (1977), p. 110.
[146] Rice (1977), p. 116.
[147] EIIp7 and EI Appendix, respectively.

the mind as a part of substance, ILG makes more sense.[148] Not much else, however, is said there about ILG. Its convenient congruity with the previous reading of a Spinozistic issue, namely that of reflexive ideas, is to suffice. Turning to the problem of "Mind Eternity," Rice recognizes this age-old obsession as an aspect of Spinoza's thought about which nothing "has generated a greater number of recent critiques and efforts at reinterpretation,"[149] and offers a brief literature review.[150] Informed by the review, Rice sides with the anti-temporalist reading of eternity,[151] and finds convincing the fairly trivial idea that eternal truths about a mode constitute and indeed are its eternity or immortality.[152] In attempting to develop past the triviality, Rice states that "the fact that true ideas outlive their possessor is true but not interesting. For Spinoza, the fact that reflexively grasped true ideas outlive their possessor while bearing some (features of) his or her consciousness is both nontrivial and interesting."[153] In this article, Rice also once again discusses the gap between the attributes, stating that while the attributes are parallel, they naturally differ here and there.[154] In the end, Rice, agreeing with Curley, finds the eternity of the human mind, an incredibly complex idea, and the eternity of the essence of the body as present in God or Nature understood through the attribute of thought, to be entirely not unique, and of the eternity of substance.[155] Moreover, reflecting on the idea of activity entailed by such an understanding of both our durational and eternal lives, Rice posits that "sensitivity to the environment and ability to interact with it in a controlled and controlling manner is what adequate activity turns out to be in the extended analysis

---

148 Lee C. Rice, "Reflexive Idea in Spinoza" in *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 28, No. 2, April 1990, p. 210.
149 Lee C. Rice, "Mind Eternity in Spinoza" in *Iyyun, The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, 41, July 1992, p. 319.
150 Rice (1992), pp. 320-23.
151 Rice (1992), p. 323
152 Rice (1992), p. 327.
153 Rice (1992), p. 329.
154 Rice (1992), p. 329. Rice is here drawing on Alexandre Matheron, "Remarques sur l'immortalité de l'äme chez Spinoza," in *Etudes sur Spinoza: Anthropologie et Politique au XVII siecle*, (Paris: Vrin, 1986), pp.7-16, who argues that it is absolutely necessary that each attribute have its own unique features.
155 Rice (1992), p. 331.

of EIV."[156] Finally in a work explicitly on ILG, and recognizing that "none have done much to connect this concept [of ILG] – a late arrival in the *Ethics*! – with Spinoza's earlier account of affectivity and love or with his general division of knowledge,"[157] Rice puts forward a reading of Spinoza's conception of love that corresponds to the "tripartite cognitive division"[158] of his *Ethics*. Passive love corresponds to the imagination and pleasure (*laetitia*); active, self-determined love, based in adequate ideas, corresponds to reason and courage and nobility (*generositas*); wholly active and fully self-determined love, based in intuitive knowledge, corresponds to intellectual love. Because of its qualities of absolute adequacy, full activity, and self-determination, it can be ascribed to God.[159] Though each successive stage depends on and draws from the previous stage, only intuitive knowledge, for Rice, warrants the label of ILG. In reflecting on the "Jewishness" of the concept thus understood, Rice finds the immanence and naturalism of Spinoza, essential to his concept of ILG, that God's love is our love, and vice versa, to be that "which Spinoza allies himself" with. The chapter ends with a particularly relevant declaration as to the importance of ILG for Spinoza, stating that "the consequences of this fact for a full understanding of Spinoza's notions of justice, civil society, and the moral status of the individual are awesome in number and content… [and speak to] the deep and underlying unity of his metaphysics and social thought."

In an assumedly relevant paper on death in Spinoza,[160] Matson almost completely skips over ILG and offers minimal engagement with Spinoza's argument for the eternity of the mind. His main concern in the work is to highlight the limits and importance of Spinoza's claims, in EIIp4-10 and

---

156 Rice (1992), p. 329.
157 Lee C. Rice, "Love of God in Spinoza" in Ravven & Goodmann (eds.), *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002), p. 93.
158 Rice (2002), p. 94.
159 Rice (2002), p. 100.
160 Wallace I. Matson, "Death and Destruction in Spinoza's Ethics" in *Inquiry*, 20 (1-4), 1977, pp. 403-417. Curiously, his "Spinoza's Theory of Mind" in *The Monist*, Vol. 55, No. 4, October 1971, pp. 567-578, despite the indication of the title, makes no mention of ILG, though he does question the hard reading of Spinoza's theory of the parallelism of the attributes (p. 577).

EIV Pref., that death is always externally caused. In the brief summary of Spinoza's concept of immortality, two pages at the end of the work, Wallace offers a "plug-in theory of a priori knowledge"[161] wherein the mind just is a collection of true ideas, themselves eternal, and which transitively cause the mind to be eternal as well. As a result, "death will merely complete the process of elimination of all that pertains to 'memory or imagination', which by then will be 'scarcely of any moment'."[162] Skipping over the love, ILG, and their roles in fending off and overcoming death, this leaves a couple of loose ends for Matson regarding his reading, namely the fact that suicide becomes, contra Spinoza, completely rational, insofar as it is the final elimination of all inadequate ideas, the source of error and pain, and that without language, tied to memory and imagination, apprehending anything, eternally, but without expression or representation, would seem to be quite hollow and meaningless.

Rotenstreich approaches ILG from Spinoza's concept of the conatus, beginning with a brief survey of the concept in Spinoza.[163] Seemingly relegating Spinoza's mysticism to his youth,[164] and avoiding a "more strict interpretation of [the conatus which] would impose on Spinoza's system a teleological connotation which is obviously alien to it,"[165] Rotenstreich finds intellectual love to be a corollary of knowledge, not a driving force leading to it, finding a univocal dependence of love on knowledge.[166] In the end, Rotenstreich only touches on the problem of transition,[167] finds yet some externality in the intuition,[168] and despite finding ILG to be a norm, if a partial one, says nothing about its role in Spinoza's political or religious thought.

---

[161] Matson (1977), pp. 413/14.
[162] Matson (1977), p. 414.
[163] Nathan Rotenstreich, "Conatus and Amor Dei: The Total and Partial Norm" in *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, Vol, 31, 1977, pp. 117-121.
[164] Rotenstreich (1977), p. 125.
[165] Rotenstreich (1977), p. 120.
[166] Rotenstreich (1977), p. 128.
[167] Rotenstreich (1977), p. 130.
[168] Rotenstreich (1977), p. 131.

Kayser, though recognizing the proximity of Spinoza's monotheism to that of the Jewish philosophical tradition,[169] generally finds a strong Neoplatonic influence in Spinoza's concept of ILG, especially its notion that love, as wisdom, leads to a supreme Good, and is creative.[170] Neoplatonically or not, ILG, Kayser rightly points out, links ethics and ontology in Spinoza.[171] Analyzing Spinoza's early writings, Kayser finds love to be the only satisfactory approach to God, for only ILG entails freedom from pain and satisfies our thirst for wisdom.[172] Expanding out from there, Kayser argues that "in general we may say that his whole philosophical development is mirrored in his interpretation of this one motif,"[173] and that "from the Short Treatise on, the concept of Amor Dei [Intellectualis] remains the pivotal motif of Spinoza's philosophy."[174] Kayser continues, stating that "Spinoza's treatment of the Love of God has, thus, to be considered as the first attempt to overcome the naïve mythological or anthropomorphical interpretation of God, as the first step toward de-mythologizing religion and breaking with a tradition that believes in miracles instead of in reason and judgment."[175] In briefly analyzing this bold pioneering development, however, Kayser finds ILG to not belong to the realm of emotions.[176] Turning to the problem of the impossibility of God's loving us in return, Kayser reads the issue as regarding one's intention in intellectually loving God.[177] In the end, Kayser maintains that "the idea of Love of God never ceased to occupy the thought of Spinoza,"[178] that "the love of God is, therefore, the very clue to every

---

[169] Rudolph Kayser, "Amor Dei: An Approach to Spinoza's Philosophy of Religion" in *The Saints of Qumran: Stories and Essays on Jewish Themes* (Associated University Press, 1977), pp. 162
[170] Kayser (1977), p. 164. That Spinoza may have received whatever Neoplatonic influence in his work in and through the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition is not broached.
[171] Kayser (1977), p. 163/4.
[172] Kayser (1977), p. 165.
[173] Kayser (1977), p. 165.
[174] Kayser (1977), p. 167.
[175] Kayser (1977), p. 170.
[176] Kayser (1977), p. 171
[177] Kayser (1977), p. 172.
[178] Kayser (1977), p. 173.

understanding, to every knowledge,"[179] and that it is the aim of humanity. Talk of mysticism and his failure to recognize ILG as an emotion aside,[180] what any of this and the rest of his analysis means for the rest of Spinoza's thought, moreover, is left completely alone. ILG, or that "Thou shalt love God," may be a "metaphysical maxim embracing every kind of existence,"[181] but the nature of that embrace, aside from simple knowing, is left untouched. In arguing that "the idea of Love of God never ceased to occupy the thought of Spinoza," the paper is really a call to apply Spinoza's concept of ILG to interpretations of his philosophy of religion, being its "religious nucleus."[182]

Talbert only arrives at the concept of ILG on the third to last page of the paper, and even then not all of the propositions demonstrating ILG are cited, with almost no analysis, again conveniently confirming the idea that virtue and freedom are "entirely consonant with Spinoza's monism."[183]

Kisner's work on virtuous passions makes a couple of excellent observations about ILG, but never follows up on them. [184]

His 2011 volume, the title of which gives us reason to be excited, disappoints as well. Spending but less than ten pages in the middle discussing how love, of God and neighbour, is the basis of benevolence, and thus politics and freedom,[185] it is one of the few work that connects Spinoza's concept of ILG to his political thought, but, again, it never follows up on it in any great detail.

---

[179] Kayser (1977), p. 173.
[180] Kayser (1997), pp. 168/9 & 170/1, respectively.
[181] Kayser (1977), p. 172.
[182] Kayser (1977), p. 173.
[183] Mattew Talbert, "Virtue and the Intellectual Love of God: Freedom in Spinoza's *Ethics*" in *Kinesis*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (1999): pp 27-42. Quotation from p. 27.
[184] Matthew Kisner, "Spinoza's Virtuous Passions" in *The Review of Metaphysics: A Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (June, 2008): pp. 759-783. "Since the highest good is so effective at increasing one's power, it also plays a more fundamental role in structuring the relations among other goods," p. 775, and "thus, Spinoza, following eudaimonistic ethics, argues, first, that the highest good is the only complete good – sought for its own sake, not for the sake of any other thing – and, second, that other goods are only valuable to the extent that they lead to the highest good," p. 776.
[185] Kisner (2011), pp. 146ff.

Taking a brief break in our review of the Anglophone literature, over in France we find a similar neglect of ILG and a comparable focus on the eternity of the mind.

Gueroult unfortunately passed away before making it to EV in his monumental study. In what we do have he speaks of all souls uniting in the intuition, but he barely develops the affective aspect, the love, something assumedly more appropriately achieved when engaging EIII, or again in EV.[186] In a brief note appended to the work on the term *sub specie aeternitatis*, Gueroult finds the eternity of reason and intuition to be one and the same as the "point of view of God… of divine eternity."[187]

Matheron's short 1972 work would seem to be *the* landmark French piece of scholarship of this period on the issue of immortality.[188] Reprinted numerous times over almost 40 years,[189] it is cited consistently and usually approvingly by both Francophone and Anglophone scholars of the issue. In the piece, Matheron argues against a strong reading of the parallelism of the attributes and for an understanding of them where each is distinguished through its special character. As a result of this flexibility on the parallelism of the attributes, immortality or the eternity of the mind is given an atemporal reading,[190] where the essence of the body exists eternally and actually in the infinite property of thought of God, and the eternal idea of the body, the mind, is of the property of extension being destined to produce this body necessarily.[191] In the end, Matheron defines the immortality of the soul as an eternal idea of the essence of the body entailing a consciousness of the affection of the body, the duration of all our effects, the content of passive effects, plus the content

---

[186] Martial Gueroult, *Spinoza II – L'ame (Ethique, II)* (1974). Maxwell??
[187] Gueroult, p. 615 (translation mine).
[188] Alexandre Matheron, "Remarques sur l'immortalite de l'ame chez Spinoza" (Remarks on the Immortality of the Soul) in *Les Etudes Philosophiques* (1972), pp. 369-372. Page numbers, however, are to the 2011 English translation, cited below.
[189] Reprinted in: *Anthropologie et Politique au XVII Siecle* (Paris: Vrin, 1986), pp. 7-16; *Etudes sur Spinoza et les Philosophies de l'age classicque* (Lyon: Ens Editions, 2011), pp. 681-691; and *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary* (Brill, 2011), pp. 295-304.
[190] Matheron (2011), p. 295.
[191] Matheron (2011), p. 299.

of active affections, which are identical to God's ideas.[192] Having supposedly solved the difficulty regarding parallelism, Matheron finds a personal immortality in the particular associations of our bodies of which our ideas are parallel, and is content with ILG.[193]

Matheron's follow up work on "The Eternal Life and the Body According to Spinoza"[194] ultimately finds our durational lives to be imagined errors and the physical correlate to our eternal thinking or spiritual selves to be universal properties of extension, common notions identified by reason, as well as our eternal place in the physical matrix of things. The progress towards intuitive knowledge, not once referred to as ILG in the work, is taken to be a gradual removal of the haphazard erroneously imagined order of interactions between ourselves and other modes, a removal that allows us to more adequately understand ourselves as eternally eternal.[195]

Finally, Matheron's only work dedicated explicitly to ILG, [196] though insightful, is at first preoccupied by the relationship between ILG at the level of reason and at the level of intuition, but soon comes to focus on the relationship between the intellectual love *of* God and the intellectual love *for* God, a relationship he finds to be as the eternal part, "exactly as our intellect is the eternal part of our soul."[197] Turning to the problem of transition towards the end of the piece, Matheron finds that the eternal joy of the intuition – the resulting aspect of joy, not the transitionary aspect, and something we both have and are, if to varying degrees,[198] is rightfully synonymous with intellectual love.[199] Not much else of relevance is said.

---

[192] Matheron (2011), pp. 301/2.
[193] Matheron (2011), pp. 301-4.
[194] Alexandre Matheron, "La Vie Eternelle et le Corps Selon Spinoza" in *Etudes sur Spinoza et les Philosophies de l'age classicque* (Lyon: Ens Editions, 2011), pp. 693-705 (Originally published in *Revue Philosophique*, No. 1, 1994).
[195] Matheron (2011), pp. 304-5.
[196] Alexandre Matheron, "L'amour intellectual de Dieu, partie eternelle de l'*amor erga Deum*" in *Etudes sur Spinoza et les Philosophies de l'age classicque* (Lyon: Ens Editions, 2011), pp. 707-725 (Originally published in *Etudes Philosophiques*, No. 2, 1997).
[197] Matheron (2011), p. 718 (translation mine).
[198] Matheron (2011), pp. 724-5.
[199] Matheron (2011), p. 723.

Other French scholars are no more concerned with ILG. Zac, in a paper on "The Relation between Life, Conatus, and Virtue in Spinoza's Philosophy,"[200] coming over a decade after a pair of assumedly relevant works not highly reviewed by Maxwell,[201] mentions ILG only towards the end, as the means to perfection,[202] as virtue itself,[203] and as salvation consisting of internal well-being accompanied by idea of God as cause.[204]

Balibar's famous *Spinoza et la Politique*,[205] a highly influential work, almost completely skips over ILG, mentioning it passingly as perhaps the most common notion,[206] but ignoring it completely in discussions of how different types of knowledge correspond to different affective regimes,[207] or in discussions of Spinoza's arguments on behalf of democracy as the most free regime.[208]

P.F. Moreau, in a book over 600 pages long, spends less than thirty total pages discussing ILG, with much of them concerned with the question of the eternity of the mind.[209]

Rodis-Lewis,[210] after a brief contrast with the terminology of the *KV*,[211] presents Spinoza as a Stoic.[212] Regarding ILG, eternity is once again the main focus,[213] and over 20 propositions of EV, including those demonstrating ILG, are quickly summarized in fewer than two pages towards the

---

[200] Sylvain Zac, "The Relation between Life, Conatus, and Virtue in Spinoza's Philosophy," trans. Charles T. Wolfe and Aaron V. Garret, in *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1996, pp. 151-173 (Originally "Vie, conatus, virtue. Rapports de ces notions dans la philosophie de Spinoza" in *Archives de Philosophie*, 40:3 (July-September, 1977).
[201] Maxwell (1990), p. 135-6. Sylvain Zac, *La Morale de Spinoza* (Paris: P. U. F., 1959), in which ILG is found to be a parallel concept to grace (p. 60), and ibid., *L'idee de vie dans la philosophie de Spinoza* (Paris: PUF, 1963), where a substantial progress is achieved in ILG between that of reason and intuition (p. 213ff).
[202] Zac (1996), p. 168.
[203] Zac (1996), p. 170/1.
[204] Zac (1996), p.172/3.
[205] Etienne Balibar, *Spinoza et la Politique* (Presses Universitaires de France, 1985). Translated by Peter Snowden as *Spinoza and Politics* (Verso, 1998).
[206] Balibar (1998), p. 100. The fifth chapter of the English translation, where this point is made, is not even in the original French version, but is a lecture originally published in *Questions de Philosophie*, no. 39, June 1989, and included in the English translation.
[207] Balibar (1998), p. 109.
[208] Balibar (1998), p. 116.
[209] P.F. Moreau, *Spinoza: L'experience et l'eternite* (Paris: P.U.F., 1994), esp. pp. 532-549.
[210] Genevieve Rodis-Lewis, "Questions sur la Cinquieme Partie de L' 'Ethique'" in *Revue Philosophique de la France et de 'Etranger*, Vol. 176, No. 2, 1986, pp. 207-221.
[211] Rodis-Lewis (1986), p. 210
[212] Rodis-Lewis (1986), pp. 215/6.
[213] Rodis-Lewis (1986), pp. 210-214.

end. The article is ultimately schematic.

Suhamy,[214] despite earnestly attempting to understand Joy as it is discussed in EV, nevertheless uses Time[215] as a rubric, quickly going over the love,[216] and never leaving the *Ethics*. In the end, eternity is that of a proof, a demonstration, the eyes of the mind,[217] though salvation, earlier identified with eternity, is a "prolepsis or an anticipation of the objection, which accompanies analepsis or retrospection"[218] – opaque concepts developed earlier in the work.

Giuseppina Totaro's article,[219] uniquely unfettered by concerns of the eternity of the mind, begins with a lengthy comparison of Spinoza's use of the term "*acquiescentia*" with that of Descartes', and ends having developed a clear line between reason and intuition for Spinoza,[220] with the *acquiescentia in se ipso*, of the intuition, being the most remote from Descartes' "satisfaction." The work, however, does not develop or apply Spinoza's concept of ILG.

The New Spinoza,[221] a recent edited volume by the next generation of continental Spinoza scholars, though with a few items from the previous generation, barely engages ILG at all. Althusser's chapter removes the intellectual component from ILG, arguing in the final pages that it is the top emotion in Spinoza's system.[222] Deleuze's chapter at least admits of ILG's constant presence and importance throughout the *Ethics*.[223] Though using mystical terminology, Deleuze

---

214 Ariel Suhamy, "Comment Parler de l'éternité? Les Joies de la V^e Partie de l' 'Ethique"' in *Les Etudes Philosophiques*, No. 2, 1997, pp. 201-221.
215 My use of the capitalized 'Time" indicates all temporal terms,' even, as according to Spinoza, eternity, which, strictly speaking, has no relation to finite time, or even any kind of infinitely composed time. Time includes time as a species thereof, as well as other temporal terms such as 'sempiternity,' and 'atemporal.'
216 Suhamy (1997), p. 202. EVp23S.
217 Suhamy (1997), p. 216
218 Suhamy (1997), p. 220 (translation mine).
219 Giuseppina Totaro, "'Acquiescentia' Dans La Cinquieme Partie de L' 'Ethique' de Spinoza," trans. by Jacqueline Lagree, in *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Etranger*, Vol. 184, No. 1, 1994, pp. 65-79. Original in Italian.
220 Totaro (1994), p. 78.
221 Warren Montag & Ted Stolze (eds.), *The New Spinoza* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).
222 Louis Althuser, "The Only Materialist Tradition, Part 1: Spinoza" in *The New Spinoza* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), pp. 3-20, p. 18.
223 Gilles Deleuze, "Spinoza and the Three 'Ethics"' in *The New Spinoza* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), p. 30, "Unlike the other two, which coexist throughout the entire course, it occupies a precise place, the final one.

argues that the ethics of Part V, the third ethic of the *Ethics*, is an "aerial book of light," that it "proceeds by flashes," and that "each of the three Ethics coexists with the others and is taken up in the others, despite their differences in kind. It is one and the same world. Each of them sends out bridges in order to cross the emptiness that separates them."[224] This is after he curiously pluralized ILG, talking of "joys" and "loves," in his earlier quite popular and influential work.[225] This same earlier work fails to list ILG in its "Chapter 4: Index of the Main Concepts of the Ethics," and references to the propositions demonstrating ILG are found sparingly and often lumped together under terms such as "Affections," "Duration," or the obvious "Eternity."[226] Despite the title of the work, ILG is only vaguely recognized as the practical ideal that it is, with Deleuze preferring to speak vaguely of "Part V" and more often than not intending the resulting eternity of the mind over the intuitive, loving, active affect that ILG is. Giancotti's chapter of *The New Spinoza*, again towards the end, dismisses the question of the eternity of the mind, arguing that immortality for Spinoza is a metaphor.[227]

Spinoza Now,[228] following up on *The New Spinoza*, has but one chapter that mentions ILG, and even then it is mentioned indirectly, as a juxtaposition to the self-destructive effects of dualist, anthropomorphic, teleological, theology.[229]

Nonetheless it was there from the start as a focus, the focal point that was already at work before it appeared. Book V must be conceived as coextensive with all the others; we have the impression of arriving at it, but it was there all the time, for all time."

[224] Deleuze (1997), p. 33.

[225] Gilles Deleuze, *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* , trans. by Robert Hurley (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988), p. 51, et passim (originally published as *Spinoza: Philosophie pratique* (Paris: PUF, 1970). His even earlier *Spinoza et le problem de l'Expression* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1968), according to Rice (2002), p. 103, n. 1, despite discussing the emotions, neglects love.

[226] Deleuze (1988), pp. 48-51, 62-3, 65-67, respectively. Neither ILG, nor its propositions, are found under "Freedom," "Good-Bad," or several other terms one would expect to find it under, especially considering his occasional comments positive of EV.

[227] Emilia Giancotti, "The Birth of Modern Materialism in Hobbes and Spinoza" in *The New Spinoza* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), p. 60.

[228] Dimitris Vardoulakis (ed.), *Spinoza Now* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

[229] Michael Mack, "Toward an Inclusive Universalism: Spinoza's Ethics of Sustainability" in Dimitris Vardoulakis (ed.), *Spinoza Now* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), pp. 99-134, esp. p. 126.

Perhaps determined by the grandeur of their scholarly predecessors, Continental scholarship – French scholarship as we have seen above and German scholarship[230] – also pays little attention to the concept of ILG, its resulting immortality or the eternity of the mind, once again, notwithstanding.

Maxwell's work, though only Part I of a larger planned study of ILG, and providing a solid though searing review of the literature on ILG up through the 1980's, primarily engages the issue of transition, remarking that "as we have seen, scholars noting this inconsistency [regarding pleasure, as an increase in power, and love, which requires the idea of an external cause, being ascribed to God] tend either to reduce the divine to the human amor or to deny that the divine amor is an affect. Both the moves contravene both divine amor and human amor. More directly for these scholars, either move destroys the human amor which they would somehow preserve."[231] Maxwell's solution, found in part by turning to the *TIE* and using the language of proximate causes over internal or external causes, thus redefines love, as active or passive based on the internality or externality of the proximate cause.[232] Noting that forty-four of the forty-eight emotions defined by Spinoza are passive (desire, pleasure, honor and self-acquiescence being the only active ones), Maxwell charitably concludes with the claim that "with this overriding concern for the passions in EIII, Spinoza understandably concentrates on definition by external causes,"[233] attributing the concern to a question of emphasis, not to oversight or deficiency in thought.

Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary has several chapters that mention ILG.[234] Ellsiepen's article on "The Types of Knowledge" describes ILG as an affective moment, dependent on

---

230 Hermann Timm's 1977 piece, cited earlier, focuses almost exclusively on the reception of Spinoza's concept of ILG as the telos of Spinoza's system in Germany in the late 18th c., barely citing EV at all.
231 Maxwell (1990), p. 153.
232 Maxwell (1990), pp. 154-5.
233 Maxwell (1990), p. 156.
234 Michael Hampe, et al. (eds.), *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary*, Vol. 196, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

knowledge of the immanent causation of God of individual things.[235] In concluding, Ellsiepen merely describes "the *Amor Dei intellectualis* as the affective side of the *scientia intuitiva* [which] reflects its cognitive structure of the manifestation of the inner divine ground at the locus of human consciousness in a mental-affective participation in the eternal. Hence, an affinity to the religious attitude is suitable for the *scientia intuitiva*."[236] De Dijn's chapter,[237] focused on EVp1-20, only has a few comments on ILG. He understands EVp21-42 as the maximalist ethical solution, to the earlier EVp1-20 minimalist solution he is concerned with, and views both ethics of EV as two perspectives, not stages, with the second being already in the first. Regarding the intuition, De Dijn states, towards the end of the work and with minimal explanation, that "it's about practical truth, theory as practice, more precisely a meditative practice oriented to the particular"[238] Kisser's chapter,[239] the only one to explicitly engage ILG, recognizes in ILG a universal principle of utility giving rise to the possibility of ethics and rational knowledge of existence, and that it "can only be understood as a logical conclusion of the entire text that precedes it.[240] Regarding the problem of the eternity of the mind, Kisser maintains that the truth of the idea of the body doesn't depend on the body's existence,[241] thus maintaining the parallelism of the attributes by understanding the intuition to be in consonance with parallelism in its maintaining thought as independent to extension.[242] That being said, Kisser allows for the pre-existence of our minds to follow just as easily and necessarily.[243] Upon discussing the dependence of the intuition on reason, on universal forms that determine the positing of ends,[244]

---

[235] Christof Ellsiepen, "The Types of Knowledge," p.140.
[236] Ellsiepen, p. 145.
[237] Herman de Dijn, "Ethics as Medicine for the Mind (5p1-20)," pp. 265-79.
[238] De Dijn, p. 278.
[239] Thomas Kisser, "The Third Category of Knowledge and the Rational Love of God," pp. 281-294.
[240] Kisser, p. 281.
[241] Kisser, p. 291.
[242] Kisser, p. 292.
[243] Kisser, p. 292.
[244] Kisser, p. 294.

Kisser argues that joy is the affective dimension of the intuition,[245] and that "in realizing our own state of being, the idea that we ourselves are, and our actions occur as conclusions from this irreducible individuality that we are, we posit ourselves autonomously as the formal cause of our self."[246] In the end, understandably confined only to the *Ethics* by the parameters of the volume, Kisser finds the basis of unity to be ILG, the productive element that allows everything to occur.

In the last decade or so there has been a spat of politically themed works that have attempted to give various readings of (usually only a particular aspect of) Spinoza's political thought. Concerned as they are with presenting the relevance of Spinoza, or, rather, a particular aspect or dimension of his political thought, or, better yet, their particular reading of said aspect or dimension of his political thought, for certain modern political debates, ILG, a concept that wreaks of theological obscurantism and whiffs anathema to modern secular liberal proclivities, is dealt with quite briefly, if at all. For example:

Despite being "an attempt to inquire into the relation between Judaism and liberalism in modern political theory" using Spinoza as a lens, Smith's *Spinoza, Liberalism, and the Question of Jewish Identity* makes no mention of ILG.[247]

In a second work, Smith is keen to recognize that ILG "is not merely an afterthought appended to Spinoza's metaphysics but the basis for a new philosophical theology, a theology without dogmas and sacraments but one that performs a powerful transformative function nonetheless."[248] He then connects ILG of the *Ethics* to the *TTP*, specifically Chapter 4, "Of the Divine Law,"[249] before turning briefly to the problem of eternity.[250] Making no attempt to solve the

---

[245] Kisser, p. 292/3.
[246] Kisser, p. 294.
[247] Steven B. Smith, *Spinoza, Liberalism, and the Question of Jewish Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), p. ix.
[248] Steven B. Smith, *Spinoza's Book of Life: Freedom and Redemption in the Ethics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 169.
[249] Smith (2003), pp. 170-1.

problem or even review solutions, Smith views its tensions instead as mirroring the tension inherent in Spinoza's work – that between striving for freedom and the restraints of an infinite system. Applying ILG to Spinoza's political thought, Smith finds it to amount to not much more than a love of neighbour, though he shortly thereafter suggests a more solitary interpretation of it.[251]

Levene,[252] turning to love in the last twenty pages of the book, skips any discussion of the problems facing ILG, most notably that of eternity, and again presents ILG as not much more than a love of neighbour, emphasizing the "man is a God to man" of EIVp35S.[253]

Sharp uses ILG, specifically EVp36 which identifies human ILG with divine ILG, to emphasize our not being a dominion within a dominion, that we are "a tiny part of nature, immersed within the infinite but nevertheless constituting part of it definitively,"[254] to rightly gird her strictly non-anthropocentric methodology and politics of the later chapters. ILG, and its propositions, however, do not appear again after the brief engagement.

Susan James, in discussing ILG,[255] and not simply love of neighbour – the intended use of ILG the majority of the time in the study, takes a shift of emphasis in *TTP*, Ch. 12, to indicate that ILG is to be taken as emotive and not intellectual, thus failing to realize the basic Spinozistic idea, demonstrated in the *Ethics*, that love in EIII is pleasure accompanied by the *idea* of an external cause, or that it is the intuition which correlates to ILG, and thus that ILG is inextricably intellectual.[256]

---

[250] Smith (2003), pp. 172-75.
[251] Smith (2003), pp. 179-182. Cf. Steven B. Smith, "Spinoza's Democratic Turn: Chapter 16 of the Theologico-Political Treatise" in *Review of Metaphysics*, Vol. 48 (December 1994), pp. 359-88, where ILG, given an individualistic reading and amounting to love of self, affords us a "secular redemption" (p. 385).
[252] Nancy K. Leven, *Spinoza's Revelation: Religion, Democracy, and Reason* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
[253] *Works*, p. 338.
[254] Hasana Sharp, *Spinoza and the Politics of Renaturalization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), p. 147.
[255] Susan James, *Spinoza on Philosophy, Religion, and Politics: The Theologico-Political Treatise* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 188ff.
[256] EIIIDE6.

Cooper's chapter on Spinoza in her study of humility in [early] modern political thought,[257] eager to herald Spinoza as a champion of the secular and counter the common narrative that modernity made man divine, prefers to speak of Spinoza's *acquiescentia* and *acquiescentia in se ipso*, effectively avoiding discussion of ILG, and rarely even citing the propositions of ILG.[258] What's more, Cooper never engages the problem that EVp36 poses for her contention against the idea that modernity, and Spinoza as one of its key representatives, divinized man. This is insofar as it reads: "The mind's intellectual love toward God is the love of God wherewith God loves himself not insofar as he is infinite, but insofar as he can be explicated through the essence of the human mind considered under a form of eternity. That is, the mind's intellectual love toward God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself."[259]

Even volumes for which one would have strong reason to expect a substantial engagement with Spinoza's concept of ILG are ultimately unsatisfying.

Despite ILG being perhaps the most Jewish value or theme there is, *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy* has but one chapter, that of Rice discussed above, that treats of ILG, and even then only from one, albeit an interesting and insightful, perspective – that of the tripartite division of knowledge and the affects.[260]

Spinoza: The Enduring Questions has three chapters that deal with time or immortality, but not one that is explicitly devoted to ILG, certainly an enduring question of Spinoza's thought and work. Savan's chapter in the volume, yet another example of a work engaging the propositions of ILG but focused almost entirely on the meaning of eternity, duration, and the issue of the eternity of the

---

[257] Julie Cooper, *Secular Powers: Humility in Modern Political Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), pp. 70-104.
[258] She does cite EVp36 in order to bring in the religiously inflected "glory," p. 92, et passim, to her discussion.
[259] *Works*, pp. 378-9.
[260] It is technically mentioned, it should be noted, usually indirectly, certainly briefly, in Lenn E. Goodman, "What does Spinoza's *Ethics* Contribute to Jewish Philosophy," pp. 17-92, in the same volume.

mind, mentions the joy of intuition fleetingly but twice, one of which is in the last paragraph of the work,[261] and no more about ILG. Savan's earlier work,[262] a lecture, and the only work from the conference the volume commemorates, fails to engage ILG at all, is full of analogies and references to modern analytic theories and thinkers, but finds ILG to depend solely on the intuition, on *Scientia intuitiva*.[263] Despite the exclusive importance of the intuition for ILG in Savan's reading, however, it is covered in but a single page,[264] and eternity, time, and duration, are covered in a couple more.[265] In the end, doubtful of whether Spinoza believed he knew much intuitively,[266] Savan finds that "the *amor intellectualis Dei* is not a cold unfeeling impassivity. It is a profound and deeply felt emotion which we control actively because we see clearly and adequately that in loving a human being we love God, and in loving God we love – indeed, God loves – human beings."[267] Morrison's chapter in *Spinoza: The Enduring Questions* makes no mention of love, or joy whatsoever.[268] Armour's chapter is concerned with developing, or inferring,[269] a theory of personal immortality in, and from, Spinoza, but fails to address the role of ILG in developing, forming, perfecting, or enjoying and loving that very same and other immortal person/s.[270]

Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy is a much needed work exploring the various connections and parallels between the two. Unsurprisingly, it has a chapter dealing with Spinoza's concept of immortality,[271] and one on his concept of the eternity of the mind.[272] The former neglects

---

[261] David Savan, "Spinoza on Duration, Time, and Eternity" in Graeme Hunter (ed.), *Spinoza: The Enduring Questions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), pp. 23, 29, respectively.
[262] David Savan, "Spinoza on Man's Knowledge of God: Intuition, Reason, Revelation, and Love" in Barry S. Kogan (ed.),*Spinoza: a Tercentenary Perspective* (Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1978), pp. 80-103,
[263] Savan (1978), pp. 81, 96-7.
[264] Savan (1978), p. 97.
[265] Savan (1978), p. 98-100.
[266] Savan (1978), p. 102.
[267] Savan (1978), p. 101.
[268] James C. Morrison, Spinoza on the Self, Personal Identity, and Immortality" in Graeme Hunter (ed.), *Spinoza: The Enduring Questions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), pp. 31-47.
[269] Leslie Armour, "Knowledge, Idea, and Spinoza's Notion of Immortality" in *Ibid*., p. 58.
[270] Armour (1994), pp. 48-63.
[271] Jacob Adler, "Mortality of the soul from Alexander of Aphrodisias to Spinoza," pp. 13-35.

discussion of ILG, and is concerned more with Spinoza's rejection of personal immortality and its sources. The latter compares Spinoza and Gersonides on intellectual eternity, arguing, *inter alia*, "that there is no need to wait for the death of the body to experience eternity."[273] ILG is, of course, brought in towards the end, insofar as it "joins the cognitive and affective dimensions of the eternity of the mind,"[274] but the problem of personal immortality takes over shortly thereafter.[275] Harvey's chapter, a short one of but eleven pages,[276] is nevertheless a fruitful study of the many conceptual,[277] philological,[278] and even hermeneutic[279] similarities between Maimonides and Spinoza in their concepts of intellectual love and pleasure. The paper brings together several of Harvey's earlier works comparing Spinoza and Maimonides, many of which will be discussed below (II.A.I.). He effectively places Spinoza's concept of ILG within the medieval Jewish (and Islamic)[280] philosophical tradition, shedding light on its sources, reaching back to Aristotle,[281] rather than on its role in the rest of his thought.

Before concluding the review, there have been, unsurprisingly, numerous works on Spinoza's concept of eternity, immortality, and the eternity of the mind in recent decades.[282] In most

---

[272] Julie R. Klein, "'Something of it remains': Spinoza and Gersonides on intellectual eternity," pp. 177-203.
[273] Klein (2015), p. 198.
[274] Klein (2015), p. 199.
[275] Klein (2015), pp. 200ff.
[276] Warren Zev Harvey, "'*Ishq*, *hesheq*, and *amor Dei intellectualis*," pp. 96-107.
[277] Harvey (2015), pp. 100-104.
[278] Harvey (2015), pp. 106-7.
[279] Harvey (2015), p. 105.
[280] Harvey (2015), pp. 105-6.
[281] Harvey (2015), pp. 98-100.
[282] To name just a few: Martha Kneale, "Eternity and Sempiternity" and Alan Donagan, "Spinoza's Proof of Immortality," both in Marjorie Grene (ed.), *Spinoza: A Collection of Essays* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1973), pp. 223-238 & 241-258, respectively, are often taken as baseline, with the occasional reference to Wolfson (1934), or Joachim (1901). Edwin Curley, "Note on the Immortality of the soul in Spinoza's Short Treatise" in *Giornale Critico della Filsofia Italiana*, Vol. 8 (1977): pp. 327-336, will be taken up when we turn to the *KV* below, Chapter III.B. C.L. Hardin, "Spinoza on Immortality and Time" in Robert W. Shahan & J.I. Biro (eds.), *Spinoza: New Perspectives* (Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press: 1978), pp. 129-138. Veronique Foti, "Spinoza's Doctrine of Immortality and the Unity of Love in *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (1979): pp. 437-42. Diane Steinberg, "Spinoza's Theory of the Eternity of the Mind" in *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. XI, No. 1 (March, 1981): pp. 35-68. Genevieve Lloyd, "Spinoza's Version of the Eternity of the Mind" in Marjorie Grene & Debra Nails (eds.), *Spinoza and the Sciences* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1986), pp. 211-233. Charles E. Jarrett, "The Development of Spinoza's Conception of

of them one will find reference to ILG, or at least its propositions, usually towards the end, conveniently presented in such a way as to bolster the previous reading of the concept of eternity in Spinoza. This review, however, is long enough, and we need not discuss every contribution to the complex issue of eternity in particular, though they, if relevant and convincing, will be made use of later in the dissertation. I mention them here, however, as scholarship on the concept of eternity, as with other proximal concepts to that of ILG, continue to typify scholarship on ILG in this fourth period.

To sum up, the scholarship on the concept ILG in this fourth period is found, once again, wanting. On the one hand, analytic, metaphysical studies maintain the myopia of the previous period, focusing almost exclusively on the resulting immortality or eternity of the mind. On the other hand, there is little to no concern on the political spectrum for the concept of ILG, let alone the desire to work out any metaphysical issues with the concept of ILG as well. The concept of ILG, despite the fact that it precisely bridges the metaphysical – political divide, is rarely the focus of study, it is often cited sparingly, discussed briefly, usually towards the end (or right at the beginning) of a work. The concept of ILG, however, when mentioned, does somehow always manage to bolster the respective arguments and readings of Spinoza, or, more accurately, of certain ideas or propositions of Spinoza's. In fact, it is often a capstone concept, but of their reading of Spinoza, reinforcing the accuracy of the reading it completes. Though it is mentioned, even summarized, it is

---

Immortality" in *Dio, L'uomo, La Liberta: Studi sil 'Breve Trattato' di Spinoza* (Rome: L.U. Japadre Editore, 1990), pp. 147-188. Frank Lucash, "Spinoza on the Eternity of the Human Mind" in *Philosophy and Theology*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1990): pp. 103-113. Barbara Stock, "Spinoza on the Immortality of the Mind" in *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, Vol.17, No. 4 (October, 2000): pp. 381-403. Julie R. Klein, "'By Eternity I Understand': Eternity according to Spinoza" in *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 51 (2002): pp. 295-324. Steven Nadler, "Eternity and Immortality in Spinoza's *Ethics*" in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, Vol. 26 (2002): pp. 224-244. Daniel Garber, "'A Free Man Thinks of Nothing Less than of Death': Spinoza on the Eternity of the Mind" in Christia Mercer & Eileen O'Neill (eds.), *Early Modern Philosophy: Mind, Matter, and Metaphysics* (OUP, 2005), pp. 104-119. Tad M. Schaltz, "Spinoza on Eternity and Duration: The 1663 Connection" and Oden Schechter, "Temporalities and Kinds of Cognition in the Treatise on the Emendation of the Intellect, the Short Treatise, and the Ethics" both in Yizhak Y. Melamed (ed.), *The Young Spinoza: A Metaphysician in the Making* (NY: OUP, 2015), pp. 205-220, 238-254, respectively.

rarely, if ever, critically analyzed. Though recognized as a crucial ideal, it is never systematically developed or applied to his ethical, political, or religious thought, and even his metaphysics.

This applies not only to the scholarship of the fourth period, but equally to that of the previous periods, and thus to the history of our scholarly understanding of the concept of ILG in Spinoza.

I.C. Problems with the Intellectual Love of God.

Having reviewed the literature, let us now take stock of the problems that, in one way or another, revolve around the concept of ILG in Spinoza. They are:

The Problem of the Eternity of the Mind: Spinoza's famous theory of the parallelism of the attributes introduced in EIIp7 (though hinted at already in EID6) states that "The order and connection of ideas is the same as the order and connection of things." However, EVp33 states that "The intellectual love of God which arises from the third kind of knowledge is eternal" and EVp23 states that "The human mind cannot be absolutely destroyed along with the body, but something of it remains, which is eternal," namely, that part of the human mind that intellectually loves God through the (second and) third kind of knowledge. Thus, it would seem that the order of certain modes of thought, namely human minds, is different than that of the order of certain modes of extension, namely human bodies, the *ideatum* of the human mind.[283] It would seem that the difference in duration, that a part of the human mind is eternal and has no eternal parallel under the attribute of extension, in the human body, contradicts the parallelism of EIIP7.

It is important here to recognize that this issue is not unique to Spinoza. Arguments for

[283] EIIP13: The object of the idea constituting the human mind is the body (p 251).

immortality, however conceived, are rather common in the history of thought and the arising disjunction between the existence of the soul and that of the body has troubled many a thinker and in fact itself goes against a very common if not universal notion that we all share: that of the inherent connection between the human mind and the human body. This tension has given rise to innumerable versions of various arguments for the mind's (or soul's) outlasting the body and even, on one end of the spectrum, for some kind of bodily existence in immortality.[284] For Spinoza, this issue immediately touches on several diverse aspects of his system: Spinoza's concept of Time and his use of several related temporal terms – e.g. eternal, infinite time, duration, finite time, indefinite time; their exact relation to the attributes of thought and extension; and the modes, specifically the human mode, understood under the attributes of thought and extension, i.e. as the human mind and body, respectively.

The Problem of Transition: Spinoza defines love as "pleasure accompanied by the idea of an external cause,"[285] where pleasure is defined as "transition from a state of less perfection to a state of greater perfection." In the explication, he even says that "pleasure is not perfection itself."[286] Thus, love involves a transition, a transition from a state of less perfection to a state of greater perfection, and is accompanied by the idea of an external cause. In EV, however, we get three propositions that complicate the matter very much. In EVp17, Spinoza states that "God is without passive emotions, and he is not affected with any emotion of pleasure or pain." Grounded in the infinite and absolute

[284] For just a few of the most obvious places where Spinoza may have been exposed to such a concept, Cf. Maimonides *Treatise on Resurrection* in Lerner (2000), pp. 154-77, also 42-55; Mishneh Torah, Helek, Sanhedrin, Ch.10, in Twersky (1972), 401-24, wherein Maimonides bases Judaism or Israel and its portion in the "world to come" on his famous Thirteen Principles of Faith, which includes a belief in the resurrection of the body.
[285] EIIIDE6, *Works*, p. 312.
[286] EIII DE3, *Works*, p. 311.

epistemic adequacy, i.e. omniscience, of God,[287] this should be seen as a rather standard and logical expression of God's absolute infinity, insofar as change, even and especially emotional change, would imply a change for or toward something and thus incompleteness or finitude on the part of the changed. Yet, in EVp35 Spinoza states that "God loves himself with an infinite intellectual love," and in EVp36 he states that "the mind's intellectual love toward God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself." Thus, it would seem that God, unique and absolutely infinite, subject to neither pleasure nor pain, loves himself with an infinite intellectual love, an infinite number of finite intellectual loves,[288] along with an idea of an external cause, itself absurd for Spinoza, all of which implies an increase in the Divine pleasure, or a transition in the Divine essence, which is, again, absurd. Therefore, the nature of the Divine ILG for itself, and the relation of human ILG to Divine ILG, needs to be explained in such a way that doesn't impute transition or change in the Divine essence.

The Problem of Divine Passivity: An issue related to that of transition, this problem arises from the conflict seemingly inherent between EVp17, stating that "God is without passive emotions," the fact that love is accompanied by the idea of an external cause, the externality of which is definitional of passivity for Spinoza, and that "God loves himself with an infinite intellectual love." Thus, God is supposedly both passive, insofar as he loves and thus has an idea of a cause external to himself, and without passive emotions, which is absurd. Therefore, ILG must be explained in such a way that doesn't impute passivity on the part of the Divine essence.

[287] The Demonstration for EVP17 depends on locating all adequate ideas in their relation to God and the earlier idea that adequate ideas involve no passivity.
[288] Whether the human mode can be or must be infinite in number for Spinoza is another question entirely, and would take us beyond the present scope, thus the ambiguous "nigh." Also, to what extent Human ILG constitutes the infinite intellectual love of God for himself is another issue a study of ILG in Spinoza should engage, and will be below.

The Problem of Reciprocity: Finally, there is EVp19, "He who loves God cannot endeavour that God should love him in return," which, is not only theologically unsettling, but seems to contradict EVp36 wherein we find out that "the mind's intellectual love toward God is the love of God wherewith God loves himself… That is, the mind's intellectual love toward God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself." Thus, our love of God is somehow not reciprocated despite our being a finite mode of God and thus certainly within the purview of God's infinite love of himself. Therefore, an explanation of ILG must be mindful of how it is that God is both infinitely loving and not loving of us in return to our love for him.

II. Intellectual Historical Excursus: Three Moments in the History of the Concept of the Intellectual Love of God in the Medieval Jewish Philosophical Tradition

This Chapter will present and analyze three moments antecedent to Spinoza in the history of the concept of the intellectual love of God (ILG). The reasons and purpose for this are several, and together support the argument of the dissertation.

One reason and purpose for this historical excursus are the concerns of an intellectual historian: to historically contextualize Spinoza's concept of ILG within intellectual history.[1] As mentioned earlier in Chapter I, I am limiting myself here to a particular vein of intellectual history, one that, despite the substantial and growing evidence, is still marginalized as a source for Spinoza's thought – that of Jewish philosophy. Though Spinoza carefully read, drew upon, and was influenced by, numerous thinkers outside of the Jewish philosophical tradition, we will nevertheless delimit the discussion to three moments in Medieval Jewish philosophy.[2] In light of the fact that the love of

[1] ILG is thus the "unit idea" of this intellectual historical excursus, as well as the dissertation at large, and the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition is but one, albeit a vital though often ignored, historical context for an adequate understanding of this concept. Cf. Arthur Lovejoy, *Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (1933). Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas" in *History and Theory*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1969), pp. 3-53. More on method can be found in the conclusion of this Chapter.

[2] Much of the recent literature that even considers the question of sources seems inordinately focused and unfortunately sufficed with the study of the Cartesian background of Spinoza. Curley's contribution to the study of Spinoza is substantial and significant, but his methodological bias for the Cartesian context (let alone for the prioritization of earlier propositions over later ones in the *Ethics*), announced unabashedly in the Postscript to his *Spinoza's Metaphysics: An Essay in Interpretation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), pp. 155ff, a work which continues to guide scholars and popular writers alike, seems to have underwritten the bias of its readers. Cf. Bennett (1984), Curley (1988), and Jean-Luc Marion (1991, 1994), for just a couple equally narrow, though nevertheless insightful and productive, approaches. Regarding the validity of a Neoplatonic background for Spinoza, specifically in his *KV*, Cf. Gebhardt (1921, 1929), Popkin in Goodman (1992). Some scholars have tapped the Stoics as another context worthy of study, see: Miller (2015) for a comprehensive recent example; for Aristotle, see: Manzini (2009); *Studia Spinozana*, Vol. 12 (1996) has the central theme of "Spinoza and Ancient Philosophy"; Wolfson's *The Philosophy of Spinoza* (1934), taken up earlier in the literature review and crucial throughout this chapter, opened the door to the whole history of medieval Jewish, Christian, and Islamic philosophy being considered as open for consideration. Methodological shortcomings aside, discussed below, unfortunately few have followed up on the myriad connections posited by Wolfson. Many can be found in the notes below. For the Marrano context, see: Yovel (1989, especially Vol. I); for several articles discussing Yovel's Marrano hypothesis, as well as a response from Yovel, see: "Symposium" in *Inquiry*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (1992), pp. 37-137; for the Dutch context, see: numerous articles in *Studia Rosenthaliana*, several works by Bunge (2001, 2003, 2012), as well as Popkin (2004) and Adler in Nadler (ed.) (2014) for discussions of the Dutch Jewish context. Regrettably, some of the recent rhetoric (e.g. Bunge (2012), Ch. 1) regarding the proper context within which to understand Spinoza has become

God, originally a Biblical concept,[3] was not mediated by the intellect, an essential aspect of Spinoza's version of the concept – the "I" in ILG, until the saturation of Hellenic thought in Judaism, this chapter will further confine itself to post-Rabbinic Jewish thought.[4] That Spinoza was highly critical of Rabbinic Judaism, even calling the Rabbis Pharisees in his *TTP*, itself a highly negative term, further supports this limiting of the scope of the chapter. Moreover, in light of the decisive and monumental presence and influence of Maimonides in Jewish thought,[5] truly a watershed thinker in the history of Jewish thought (if not thought *simpliciter*),[6] this chapter will again further confine itself to the Jewish tradition from Maimonides on.[7] For, it is arguably with Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* that the saturation of Hellenic thought in Judaism finally catalyzed the tradition.[8] This is especially so since later medieval Jewish thinkers, in large part, attempted either to correct Maimonides' Hellenic inflected conception of Judaism to better fuse the two traditions, or were critics of the very goal of reconciling the two, e.g. Gersonides and Crescas, respectively.[9] Finally,

---

an overly zero-sum affair. Though I am at pains here to demonstrate the importance of medieval Jewish philosophy for an accurate understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG, it bears reiterating that my claims are not exclusive. There is yet much work to be done on the question of Spinoza's sources. The impact of Latin and Roman orators, rhetoricians, and historians on Spinoza, a large number of whom filled his bookshelves, is a particularly glaring lacuna.

[3] Deut. 6:5, and others.

[4] This is not to say that Rabbinic thought was completely free of Hellenic influence, nor that it did not treat of the intellectual aspect of the love of God. For Rabbinic treatments of the concept, see: Jon Levenson, *The Love of God: Divine Gift, Human Gratitude, and Mutual Faithfulness in Judaism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), esp. chapter 2; Georges Vajda, *L'Amour de Dieu dans la Theologie Juive du Moyen Age* (Paris: Vrin, 1957), esp. chapter 1.IV, pp. 34-67. Bracketing Philo, Vajda posits that in the history of Jewish thought the *intellectual* love of God was first discussed by Saadia. See: *Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, II.XIII, cited by Vajda (p. 76).

[5] The expression "From Moses [the prophet] to Moses [Maimonides], there is none like Moses" comes to mind here. This phrase was already a "popular saying" by 1761 when Chaplain Rabe, a Christian, applied it to Moses Mendelssohn (Altmann (1973), p. 197).

[6] "Not only did the *Guide* render all previous Jewish philosophy almost obsolete, but it is barely an exaggeration to call all subsequent medieval Jewish philosophy 'Maimonidean'" (Harvey, 1980, p. 249).

[7] Though we do not know the full extent of Spinoza's exposure to pre-Maimonidian Jewish thinkers, Ibn Ezra, insofar as Spinoza at least mentions him in his works (*TTP*, Ch. 1, n. 1; Ch. 8), is certainly one such figure. Waxman (1929) would include Saadia in this list. For Ibn Ezra and Spinoza, Cf. Rudavsky in Nadler (2014), Harvey in Rosenthal & Melamed (2010) and Ravven & Goodman (2002), p. 286, s.v. Ibn Ezra, Abraham.

[8] Steven Harvey (2013) locates the integration of Aristotle's massively influential *Nicomachean Ethics* into Jewish philosophy with Maimonides' *Guide*, and through it into the rest of medieval Jewish philosophy. Though this is only one such Hellenic text, the article shows how important a role Maimonides' *Guide* had in disseminating Greek ideas and philosophy into Judaism.

[9] "Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* made such an impact on the medieval Hebrew philosophic literature that all subsequent medieval Jewish philosophers philosophized under its influence, even when – like Hasdai Crescas – they

Maimonides' accolades of "Master," or "Second Teacher," the First Teacher being Aristotle, further supports this understanding of Maimonides as a watershed. The following will thus attempt to historically contextualize Spinoza's concept of ILG within the post-Maimonidean medieval Jewish philosophical tradition through a comparative analysis of the concept of the intellectual love of God in three medieval Jewish thinkers: Maimonides (1138-1204), Hasdai Crescas (1340-1410), and Judah Abarbanel (1465~1523). This will allow us to better understand the conceptual and philosophical stakes of the concept of ILG and the systems within which we find it, generally speaking, as well as to discern what if anything is novel or distinctive in Spinoza's concept of ILG and its role in his system.

Building on this comparative analysis, another reason and purpose for this excursus is to argue for the importance of Jewish philosophy, specifically medieval Jewish philosophy, as represented by the above mentioned thinkers, for an adequate understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG. Generally speaking, the history of our understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG, outlined in the literature review above, closely parallels that of the scholarly understanding of the relationship between Spinoza's philosophy and medieval Jewish philosophy. The affinity was immediately though perhaps not so critically noted by Spinoza's contemporaries and the proceeding generations,[10] if only to summarily dismiss Spinoza's (or Descartes')[11] thought as materialistic and heretical. By the end of the 18th and into the 19th century, Jewish scholars in Germany found ideological motivation in fleshing out this connection as thoroughly and extensively as possible. For, as one scholar

---

attacked it" (Harvey, 1981, p. 155). "All [Jewish] philosophical speculation of this [post-Maimonidean medieval] period related in the first place, either positively or negatively, to *The Guide of the Perplexed*…" (Pines, 1967, p. 2.)

[10] Steven Nadler, "Introduction" in Steven Nadler (ed.), *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 1. Richard Popkin, "Spinoza, Neoplatonic Kabbalist?" in *Neoplatonism and Jewish Thought* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992), pp. 387-411, discusses the ascription of Kabbalism to Spinoza.

[11] Levy (1989), p. 28ff, drawing on Sonne (1925), argues that "paradoxically, the Cartesians repudiated Spinoza by the argument that his affiliation to the Kabbalah divides between him and them while their adversaries tried to stress the relations between them and Spinoza" in order to connect Spinoza's supposed atheistic and materialistic errors to Descartes, and thus discredit the two in one shot.

convincingly argues,[12] with acceptance, integration, let alone emancipation, becoming increasingly closed off to the Jewish population, Jewish scholars hoped that showing Spinoza to be a Jew (!), whose ultimately Jewish philosophy grounded and most forcefully argued for the very same liberal ideals and principles of the Enlightenment found to be so important in the shaping of German society, culture, and its future, would re-open those avenues at least for Jewish acculturation, if not emancipation. With those ideological motivations violently and horrifically rebuffed in the middle of the 20th century, but in large part building on the historical, philosophical, and philological, if ideologically motivated, work of previous centuries, some scholars in recent decades have once again seriously inquired into Spinoza's indebtedness to medieval Jewish thought (albeit focusing heavily on Maimonides),[13] and have furthered and nuanced our understanding Spinoza's concept of ILG.[14] Considering my argument that to deepen our understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG requires an examination of Spinoza's medieval Jewish sources,[15] this timing should come as no surprise. There is much work to be done on the question of Spinoza's sources, especially with regards to the Jewish philosophical tradition. However, that the three thinkers we are to consider and their chief works were known to and exercised an influence on Spinoza, to at least some extent, is now hardly

[12] David J. Wertheim, "Spinoza's Eyes: The Ideological Motives of German-Jewish Spinoza Scholarship" in *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (2006), pp. 234-246. Wertheim locates the critical change in attitudes towards Spinoza's liberalism with Mendelssohn's defense of Lessing's supposed Spinozism (p. 238). Prior to Mendelssohn, Spinozism/liberalism was an accusation leveled at impious and dangerous reformers, whereas post Mendelssohn Spinozism/liberalism informed and guided German conceptions of universal and civil religion, even giving rise, on the other end, to the German Romantic mystical tradition of reading Spinoza (p. 239f). The shift, Wertheim argues, depended in large part on successfully showing that such rationalist ideas as held by Spinoza and even so great a cultural hero as Lessing, contrary to the concerns and predictions of Jacobi, do not necessarily lead to fatalism, atheism, nihilism, and immorality. Rather, as evidenced by the peaceful and respectful lives Spinoza and Lessing ultimately held, rationalism can in fact lead to a profound and moral, maybe even mystical (!), understanding of God and existence.

[13] *Studia Spinozana*, Vol. 4 (1988/9), is dedicated to the central theme of "Spinoza and Jewish Identity," and has several articles of worth on the issue. Though there have been several more recent articles, here and there, on this issue, and it is discussed by biographers of Spinoza, book length treatments, however, remain rare,: Ravven and Goodman (eds.) *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002); Steven Nadler (ed.) *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[14] Harvey's, Nadler's, and Melamed's work on this issue must be mentioned here.

[15] I am not alone in this argument. Cf. Harvey's "Biblical Sources for 'Glory' in Spinoza's Ethics" (Hebrew) in *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 48, 1999, pp. 447-449; Idem, "*'Ishq*, *hesheq*, and *amor Dei intellectualis*" in Steven Nadler (ed.), *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 96-107; Nadler (the introduction to the previous volume, 2001, 2009); Melamed (2014, 2017).

in doubt, but yet all too often ignored. This is even the more so regarding Spinoza's concept of ILG in particular. The following will thus serve to reinforce the continuity between Spinoza and medieval Jewish philosophy by arguing for the relevance of this particular vein of intellectual history for understanding Spinoza's concept of ILG, and, through the concept of ILG, much of the rest of Spinoza's thought.

There is a third reason and purpose in contextualizing Spinoza's concept of ILG within the history of medieval Jewish philosophy, namely: to bolster the argument, begun in Chapter I, against those who would deny the centrality, the legitimacy, if not the very existence, of the concept of ILG in Spinoza's thought. For, by demonstrating the deep and thoroughgoing parallels between Spinoza's concept of ILG and that of the three representative medieval Jewish thinkers taken up below, making sense of its role and function in Spinoza should no longer baffle or befuddle. Moreover, by demonstrating that the concept of ILG was a central if not the cardinal concept in this historical vein, one that was known to and of seminal influence on Spinoza, that it was also exactly that – cardinal – for Spinoza – again, the very thesis of this dissertation – gains yet further and substantial support.

A final reason and purpose for this historical excursus is to undergird both my reading of the concept of ILG in Spinoza's corpus, undertaken in Chapter III below, and my presentation of Spinoza's ethical, political, and religious thought in light of the cardinality of ILG for his system, undertaken in Chapter IV below. As scholars have finally begun to increasingly confirm, and as I have begun to argue, but with regards to the concept of ILG in particular, much of Spinoza's philosophy, and in particular his conception of ILG, can be properly and fully understood only within the background of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition, and especially as represented by the three thinkers I shall consider. Accordingly, at the end of the Chapter, I will provide an

historical narrative that draws a clear and direct line from Maimonides' concept of ILG, through Crescas' and Abarbanel's to Spinoza's, arguing that by taking Maimonides as baseline, as he was for all subsequent medieval Jewish thought, understood through the critical lens of Crescas, and with Judah Abarbanel's philosophy of the immanence of cosmic love, one has adumbrated much of Spinoza's concept of ILG, and indeed much of Spinoza's system. To the degree that such a narrative is convincing, it should confirm my understanding that much of the historical difficulty in understanding Spinoza's concept of ILG, as well as certain other aspects of his thought, must be explained by an ignorance, willful or otherwise, of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition. While my approach runs the risk of overstating the importance and impact of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition on Spinoza, and should, once again, not be taken to deny the relevance of other traditions and thinkers, the following Chapter should illustrate to what extent Spinoza was beholden to the medieval philosophical tradition, at least with regards to the concept of ILG.

Drawing on existing scholarship, a brief discussion of the general connection between the sub-chapter's particular medieval Jewish thinker and Spinoza will begin each sub-Chapter below. Upon establishing the general connection and discussing several points of contact between their thought, we will turn to their concept of ILG specifically, presenting and analyzing their concept of ILG itself, if from an admittedly Spinozistic perspective

II.A. The Concept of the Intellectual Love of God in Maimonides' *Moreh Nevukhim* (Guide of the Perplexed).

II.A.i. The Connection.

Aside from the circumstantial fact that Maimonides' *Guide* was found on Spinoza's bookshelf upon his death,[16] the connection between Maimonides[17] and Spinoza is evidenced in the Spinozan text. In the *TTP* there are several instances where Spinoza explicitly quotes and cites Maimonides' *Guide*.[18] There are also numerous implicit references, almost exclusively regarding issues of Biblical hermeneutics, but with no direct citation.[19] Spinoza's *TTP*, at least, thus certainly demonstrates Spinoza's familiarity with, if not intimate knowledge of certain aspects of, the *Guide*. In Ch. 5 of his *TTP*, Spinoza even cites, however incorrectly, Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, evidencing a wider engagement with Maimonides' thought than merely through the *Guide*.[20] That Spinoza had already begun working on his *Ethics* before deciding on a hiatus in 1665 to produce what would become the *TTP*,[21] published anonymously in 1670, and then returned to the *Ethics* for his few remaining years, stands firmly against the idea that Judaism, or Jewish thinkers, chief amongst them

---

[16] Specifically, it was the Spanish edition published in Venice in 1551. A.J. Servaas Van Rooijen, *Inventaire des livres formant la bibliotheque de Baruch Spinoza, publie d'apres un document inedit, avec des notes biographiques et bibliographiques et une introduction* (le Haye: W.C. Tengeler, 1888), p. 132. Jacob Freudenthal (1899), p. 276, indicates that this edition includes the commentaries of Shem Tov ben Joseph ibn Shem Tov and Profiat Duran (Efodi). Unfortunately, as any honest scholar must regrettably admit, owning a book does not necessarily entail having read it, let alone having been influenced by it. The relative expense of books back in the 17th c. attenuates this only to a minor degree.
For more on the history of Spinoza's books and the various attempts to catalogue and even reproduce his library, see: Adri K. Offenberg, "Spinoza's library. The Story of a Reconstruction" in *Quaerendo*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (1973), pp. 309-321.
[17] Moses ben Maimon (1138-1204). For biography, there have been several excellent recent works: Kraemer (2008), Stroumsa (2009), Davidson (2005, 2011).
[18] For explicit mention of Maimonides in the *TTP*: Ch. 1, *Works*, p. 397; Ch.5, *Works*, p. 443; Ch. 7, *Works*, p. 468-470 (citing *Guide* II.25); Ch. 10, *Works*, p. 492/3; Ch. 10, n. 25, *Works*, p. 579; Ch. 15, *Works*, p. 520, 523. Also, Ep. 43, *Works*, p. 881.
[19] For implicit allusion or reference in the *TTP*: Ch. 1, *Works*, p. 399, 400; Ch. 2, *Works*, p. 407, 408. Ch. 3, *Works*, p. 421; Michael Morgan, the editor of the *Works*, simply footnotes the title of *TTP* Ch. 1, stating that "Throughout Chapters 1 and 2 Spinoza has Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* before him. The reader should consult Part 2, chapters 32-45 of the *Guide*" (*Works*, p. 394). An exhaustive list of implicit references would likely be much larger, if perhaps less certain.
[20] *Works*, p. 443.
[21] Ep. 28, *Works*, p. 840-1, refers to a "third part of my Philosophy," namely, the *Ethics*. Ep. 30, *Works*, p. 843-4, states "I am *now* writing a treatise on my views regarding Scripture" (emphasis mine), namely, the *TTP*. Both letters are dated to 1665.

being Maimonides, occupied him solely in his youth, or at least certainly not during the writing of his *Ethics* – his "mature" (read: certainly not Jewish) philosophical work. For, as the above timing indicates, Spinoza's engagement with the thought of Maimonides for his *TTP*, something undeniable,[22] took place right in the middle of his composing of the *Ethics*.[23] Ep. XLIII,[24] dated to 1671, also references Maimonides, and thus extends the latest possible date for a direct reference to Maimonides we have evidence for to about but six years before Spinoza's death, after the publication of the *TTP*, during the time he had assumedly returned to his *Ethics*, and even, perhaps, during the composition of the unfinished *TP*. In light of the fact that the *Ethics* doesn't cite a single thinker, and thus its sources are opaque, we must look elsewhere for guidance. According to one scholar, and supported by a few more recent scholars,[25] "this means that the *Treatise* is the key to [the question of the sources of] Spinoza's philosophy and particularly to its matured expression in the *Ethics*. The thought of the *Ethics* is in the *Treatise* […] but the literary background too of the *Ethics* can be none other than that of the *Treatise*. Whatever source or material be sought for the *Ethics*, it must at least include the source and material of the *Treatise*. If then we can discover the material out of which the *Treatise* was constructed, we can say definitely and dogmatically that this material at least (whatever else may be suggested) was present to Spinoza's mind during the period of the

[22] There is conceptual space for one to argue that all traces of Maimonides in the *TTP* are but holdovers from the contested *apologia* that Spinoza supposedly wrote earlier, after being excommunicated in 1656, and which was reportedly integrated into the *TTP*. This, however, would require the highly unlikely bordering on absurd idea that Spinoza maintained those traces and sections in integrating the earlier work, but never reconsidered or engaged its Maimonidean content during the five years he spent composing the final product.

[23] "[The *Ethics* and the *TTP*] spring from the same period of the author's life and are from the chronological point of view intimately intertwined. This fact has been generally acknowledged, but its significance for the investigation of the sources of Spinoza seems to have escaped notice" (Roth (1924), pp. 62f).

[24] *Works*, p. 881.

[25] Though there yet remains somewhat of a divide between scholars of Spinoza's political and metaphysical projects, many, though certainly not all, scholars draw on both the Ethics and the TTP in support of their arguments. My claim here is stronger than but a few or even several parallels between Spinoza's two completed mature works. For two attempts to delineate this far more detailed and complex connection, see: Edwin Curley, "Notes on a Neglected Masterpiece: The *Theological-Political Treatise* as a Prolegomenon to the *Ethics*" in Jan Cover & Mark Kulstad (eds.), *Central Themes in Early Modern Philosophy* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1990), pp. 109-159; Yitzhak Melamed, "The Metaphysics of the *Theological-Political Treatise*" in Yitzhak Melamed & Michael A. Rosenthal (eds.), *Spinoza's Theological-Political Treatise: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 128-142.

composition of the *Ethics*."[26] Put more simply, "…the [*TTP*] is an invaluable resource for understanding Spinoza's metaphysics."[27] Considering, then, the intimate connection between the philosophy of the *TTP* and the *Ethics*, the abundance of direct and indirect references to Maimonides in the *TTP*, as well as the timing of the production of Spinoza's two completed mature works, we can safely, perhaps even "dogmatically," say that Maimonides must have been a source for the thought of both the *TTP* and the *Ethics* – in short, Spinoza's mature philosophy. The case, however, only gets stronger.

Before moving on from the erroneous yet still prevalent charge that Judaism was for Spinoza, if anything, but a youthful preoccupation, it is interesting to note that his earlier works (the *TIE*, the *KV*, and the *PPC* + *CM*), in contradistinction to the later *TTP*, exhibit no explicit reference to Maimonides, or other Jewish thinkers. Admittedly, these early works generally cite almost no-one and some recent scholarship has fortunately begun the difficult work of uncovering Spinoza's hidden, occasionally Jewish, sources and interlocutors in these early works.[28] The fact, however, that references, direct or indirect, to Jewish thinkers, evidence of the enduring and manifest significance of medieval Jewish philosophy for Spinoza, only increase in number and in their substantiality in Spinoza's mature thought argues against the relegation of the importance of Judaism to Spinoza's youth. *A fortiori*, it argues against those who would dismiss any investigation into Spinoza's Jewish sources entirely. In fact, it is precisely this point, *inter alia*, that allowed Joel, almost 150 years ago, to argue that the mature Spinoza left Descartes and Cartesianism and returned to the Jewish philosophy of his youth in his later years.[29]

Returning to the task at hand, ten years after Roth argued for the intimate connection

---

[26] Roth (1924), p. 63.
[27] Melamed (2010), p. 142.
[28] Chapters by Newland and Melamed in Melamed (2015)
[29] Joel, *Zur Genesis der Lehre Spinozas* (1871), pp. 8ff.

between the *TTP* and the *Ethics* regarding their common source in Maimonides,[30] H.A. Wolfson's masterful two-volume work forever changed our understanding of Spinoza's sources.[31] Though the work took its "philosophic license"[32] in "construct[ing] hypothetically the arguments"[33] for every proposition of the *Ethics* a bit too far, "throwing around passages helter-skelter (often without explanation),"[34] and was ideologically motivated to "provide a counter-narrative to Hegel's Christian historiography of the history of philosophy,"[35] Wolfson was nevertheless successful in offering "an abundance of undreamed-of new material, culled from the writings of various philosophers ranging from Aristotle to Descartes"[36] for the comparative study of Spinoza. In the end, Wolfson opened up almost the whole of medieval Jewish, Christian, and Islamic philosophy as plausible sources for Spinoza's thought. All that remained now was to follow up on Wolfson's myriad connections and to delineate the specific points of contact.[37]

Almost 50 years after Wolfson's magisterial 1934 work,[38] Warren Zev Harvey's highly influential 1981 essay "A Portrait of Spinoza as a Maimonidean"[39] was nevertheless "admittedly

---

[30] Leo Strauss, *Spinoza's Critique of Religion* (NY: Schocken Books, 1965), originally published in German in 1930, should be mentioned here.
[31] Harry Austryn Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza: Unfolding the Latent Process of His Reasoning* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1934).
[32] Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, 1934, p. vi.
[33] Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, 1934, p. viii.
[34] Steven Nadler, "The Jewish Spinoza" in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 70, No. 3 (Jul., 2009), p. 497.
[35] Yitzhak Y. Melamed, "Introduction" to *The Young Spinoza* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 2.
[36] Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, 1934, p. ix.
[37] "It must be confessed that [Wolfson]'s erudition often seems to overreach itself, but the possibility remains a possibility" (Roth, *Spinoza* (1934), p. 223). A modern scholar's take is less generous: "For Wolfson's famous study is perhaps the best example of the patchwork approach to Spinoza, but at best it leaves us with a set of interesting but unverifiable possibilities, at worst a set of answers for which we often have no matching questions" (Lee C. Rice in "Love of God in Spinoza" in *Jewish Themes* (2002), p. 101.)
[38] Also deserving mention here are: Leo Strauss, *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (Free Press, 1952), especially Ch. 5 (originally published in 1948); Genevieve Brykman, *La Judeite de Spinoza* (Paris: Vrin, 1972); as well as several works by Shlomo Pines ("Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, Maimonides, and Kant" in *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 20 (1968), pp. 3-54; "Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* and the Jewish Philosophical Tradition" in Isadore Twersky & Bernard Septimus (eds.), *Jewish Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), pp. 499-521; and "On Spinoza's Conception of Human Freedom and of Good and Evil"). These works, however, tend to focus more exclusively on the connection between Maimonides and Spinoza's *TTP*.
[39] Warren Ze'ev Harvey, "A Portrait of Spinoza as a Maimonidean" in *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 19, No. 2, April 1981, pp. 151-172.

controversial"[40] in its thesis that Maimonides had a massive and thoroughgoing influence on Spinoza's philosophy – not just in the *TTP* , but also and especially in the *Ethics*. This is insofar as they not only agree on a large number of fundamental elements in their philosophies, but present and phrase these elements similarly, as well as use similar arguments and proof texts in their support. With copious notes and references to the *Guide* and the *Ethics*, Harvey takes up many of these parallels, the sheer number and depth of which is astounding, and some of which are worth reviewing: A) a strong distinction between the intellect and the imagination;[41] B) That the intellect distinguishes between truth and falsehood while the imagination leads to error; C) That knowledge is of what exists and that a true idea corresponds to existence;[42] D) That God is Truth;[43] E) That the intellect is a human's substantial form or essence, the bond between God and human; F) That God knows a human by the selfsame intellect by which a human knows God, and vice versa;[44] G) That the imagination depends on the body, and in turn cannot conceive of incorporeality;[45] H) That the intellect is a divine power and the imagination an animal one; I) That good and evil are ultimately subjective,[46] imagined notions concerned with utility,[47] dependent on one's particular body or physical context;[48] J) That imagination gives rise to disagreement, whereas the intellect attains to knowledge of the necessary, the true and the false, about which everyone who knows is everywhere always in agreement.[49] Harvey concludes the "Maimonidean-Spinozistic analysis of 'good' and

[40] Harvey (1981), p. 151.
[41] Harvey (1981), pp. 155, 157.
[42] Harvey (1981), p. 156.
[43] Ibid., p. 156.
[44] Ibid., pp. 156/7.
[45] Ibid., p. 157.
[46] Ibid., p. 158.
[47] Ibid., p. 158.
[48] Ibid., pp. 158/9.
[49] Ibid., pp. 158/9.

'evil'"[50] by stating that "Spinoza's understanding of the intellect, the imagination, and the opposition between them … is not only Maimonidean in its fundamentals, but is even illustrated by a Maimonidean allegory" of Adam and Eve's fall.[51] Harvey goes on to argue that Spinoza's claim that the knowledge of God and His actions is tantamount to knowledge of nature and its causal interconnection is a logical result of his famous "*Deus sive Natura*," and is "typically Maimonidean."[52] Spinoza and Maimonides, Harvey continues, both share the unique anti-anthropocentric opinions that humans are not nature's end, that existence has no end outside itself, and that human prejudice is responsible for these erroneous teleological ascriptions to begin with.[53] That God is the cause of all things.[54] Following up on Pines' suggestion that Maimonides' God is "perilously close to Spinoza's attribute of thought (or to his Intellect of God),"[55] Harvey argues that Spinoza understood Maimonides' conception of God to be "as if through a cloud," and that if followed to its logical conclusion, based on the Aristotelian identification of the knowing subject, the known object, and the act of knowing, espoused by Maimonides in I:68, then "if extended space is intellectually cognized by God, then God – being the intellectually cognized Object – must be extended!"[56] Harvey even finds Maimonides' influence in Spinoza's conceptions of religion and piety, for "true religion is the love that attends to the intellectual knowledge of God; and true piety is the performance of acts of beneficence that results from that knowledge."[57] All of these points of influence in the realms of psychology, epistemology, ethics, and metaphysics, Harvey argues, are

---

[50] Ibid., pp. 159; Harvey is here, throughout the "analysis," drawing heavily on his 1978 "Maimonides and Spinoza on the Knowledge of Good and Evil" in *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2/3, pp. 167-185 (Hebrew), itself building off of Pines' article on the same topic.
[51] Ibid., pp. 160/1.
[52] Ibid., p. 162.
[53] Ibid., p. 163.
[54] Harvey (1981), p. 164.
[55] Harvey (1981), p. 164, citing Pines' "Philosophic Sources of the *Guide*," in *Guide* (1963), p. xcviii.
[56] Ibid., p. 165. Cf. Carlos Fraenkel, "Maimonides' God and Spinoza's *Deus Sive Natura*" in *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 44, No. 2, 2006, pp. 169-215, for a more lengthy and penetrating comparison of the God of Maimonides with that of Spinoza; also, Seeskin in Nadler (2014), pp. 108-127.
[57] Harvey (1981), p. 167.

sure to spill over into Spinoza's political thought as well, though the influence may be harder to discern insofar as Spinoza's political thought shares much more with his contemporaries than his thought in other realms does.[58] Thus, Spinoza's elitism and the tensions that causes in the face of his dismal opinion of the vulgar masses, as well as the political concern to combat or minimize these tensions is traced by Harvey to Maimonides, not Hobbes. Moreover, both Maimonides and Spinoza, contra Hobbes, hold intellectual unity and a passionless existence to be a socio-political ideal, the attainment of which depends entirely on the intellect, not on the imagination.[59] After all these parallels and points of influence, Harvey ends his landmark article with a discussion of where Spinoza and Maimonides differ, namely on the issues of Jewish or Mosaic Law and popular religion.[60]

Since Harvey' extensive delineation of parallels between almost every aspect of the thought of Maimonides and Spinoza,[61] several other scholars have taken up on Harvey's claim "that there was a distinctive Maimonidean influence on Spinoza's philosophy," making the claim no longer controversial.[62] I thus find the general question of the connection between Maimonides and Spinoza

---

[58] Ibid., p. 168.
[59] Ibid., p. 169
[60] Ibid., pp. 170-2. Harvey also offers a brief discussion that affords us an explanation of Spinoza's pro-Christian sentiments as exoteric concessions to his audience.
[61] Harvey has followed up on his article since. For a comprehensive examination of Harvey's literary output with regards to Spinoza and Maimonides, including an assumedly exhaustive bibliography, see: Alexander Green, "A Portrait of Spinoza as a Maimonidean Reconsidered" in *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 1, Fall 2015, pp. 81-106.
[62] Of particular note: Ze'ev Levy, *Baruch or Benedict: On Some Jewish Aspects of Spinoza's Philosophy* (NY: Peter Lang, 1989); Idit Dobbs-Weinstein, "Maimonidean Aspects in Spinoza's Thought" in *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 1-2, 1994, pp. 153-174; Heidi M. Ravven, "Some Thoughts on What Spinoza learned from Maimonides about the Prophetic Imagination, Part 1. Maimonides on Prophecy and the Imagination" in *Journal of the History of Philosophy* , Vol. 39, No. 2, April 2001, pp. 193-214; Ibid., "Some Thoughts on What Spinoza learned from Maimonides on the Prophetic Imagination, Part 2. Spinoza's Maimonideanism" in *Journal of the History of Philosophy* , Vol. 39, No. 3, July 2001, pp. 385-406; Ibid., "The Garden of Eden: Spinoza's Maimonidean Account of the Genealogy of Morals and the Origin of Society" in *Philosophy and Theology* , Vol. 13, No. 1 (2001), pp. 3-51; Moshe Idel, "Deus sive Natura: The Metamorphosis of a Dictum from Maimonides to Spinoza" in *Maimonides and the Sciences* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000), pp. 87-110; Steven Nadler, *Spinoza's Heresy: Immortality and the Jewish Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001); Several chapters in Ravven & Goodman (eds.), *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002); Catherine Chalier, *Spinoza Lecteur de Maimonide: La Question Theologico-Politique* (Paris: Les Editions Cerf, 2006); Arthur J. Jacobson, "Prophecy without Prophets: Spinoza and Maimonides on Law and the Democracy of Knowledge" in

has been more than sufficiently established for our purposes. What remains for us now is to trace that connection with regards to the concept of the intellectual love of God.

II.A.ii. Maimonides' Concept of the Intellectual Love of God.

The *locus classicus* for the concept of the intellectual love of God (ILG) in Maimonides is *Guide* III.51. The concept, important as it is in Judaism, is certainly discussed elsewhere in the Maimonidean corpus, often alongside the biblical sources of the concept, e.g. Deut. 6:5, among others, or when discussing love, worship, and other cognate concepts. Some such instances will be cited below, but only in support of the following presentation of the concept in the *Guide*.[63] Spinoza's knowledge of Maimonides' earlier, more legal, works,[64] let alone their influence on Spinoza, is uncertain,[65] whereas that of the *Guide*, due to the work of scholars like Wolfson, Harvey, et al., is not. Thus, it is to the concept of ILG in *Guide* III.51 to which we now turn.

Guide III.51, wherein Maimonides gives us his fullest discussion of his concept of ILG, is the fourth to the last chapter of the entire *Guide*, and begins the concluding section of the *Guide*. Similarly,[66] in the *Ethics*, the final 22 propositions of the final part, EVp21-p42, wherein Spinoza gives us his fullest discussion of his concept of ILG, constitute a concluding section. Just like in the

---

Dimitris Vardoulakis (ed.), *Spinoza Now* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), pp. 135-160; Several chapters in Steven Nadler (ed.), *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Yitzhak Melamed, "Spinoza and some of his Medieval Predecessors on the *Summum Bonum*" in German & Halper (eds.), *The Pursuit of Happiness in Medieval Jewish and Islamic Thought* (Forthcoming).

Some scholars have focused on the differences between Maimonides and Spinoza. For the only book-length treatment of this issue that I know of, see: Joshua Parens, *Maimonides and Spinoza: Their Conflicting Views of Human Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012). Also see: Steven Frankel, "Spinoza's Rejection of Maimonideanism" in Steven Nadler (ed.) *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 79-95.

[63] Vajda, p. 118-129, here discusses ILG in Maimonides' non-*Guide* works.

[64] As mentioned previously, Spinoza does cite, however wrongly, Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, specifically the Book of Kings, chapter 8, law 11 in *TTP*, Ch. 5, *Works*, p. 443.

[65] The question of the influence of Maimonides' earlier works on Spinoza, in light of their legal focus, leads one to the position that their influence was, if anything, as a point of critique, which in itself can be a substantial influence. However, to the extent that the *Guide* contains those very same doctrines, which, at least on the surface or exoteric reading it certainly does, renders further investigation redundant to our present task.

[66] Harvey (2014), p. 96, makes the same comparison.

Guide, then, the discussion of ILG in the *Ethics* is a final capstone topic. Moreover, as Harvey notes, there is a noticeable change in tone in these discussions from the rest of the works within which we find them.[67]

With Spinoza's concept of ILG in mind, we may examine *Guide* III.51 which begins with a rather striking declaration:

> This chapter that we bring now does not include additional matter over and above what is comprised in the other chapters of this Treatise. It is only a kind of conclusion, at the same time explaining the worship as practiced by one who has apprehended the true realities peculiar only to him after he has obtained an apprehension of what He is; and it also guides him toward achieving this worship, which is the end of man, and makes known to him how providence watches over him in this habitation until he is brought over to the bundle of life.[68]

Compare the above to Spinoza's declaration in the scholium to EVp20, a proposition whose scholium both summarizes the preceding twenty propositions, and introduces his concluding section:

> And now I have completed all that concerns this present life… So it is now time to pass on to those matters that concern the duration of the mind without respect to the body.[69]

Both passages similarly state that they've achieved the goals of their respective works, that the following is a kind of conclusion, and that, having finished their discussions of things pertaining to our present lives, they both now move on to questions pertaining to eternal life.

Moreover, compare the above quotation from *Guide* III.51 to some of the last words found in the *Ethics*:

> I have now completed all that I intended to demonstrate concerning the power of the mind over the emotions and concerning the freedom of the mind… The wise man, insofar as he is considered such, suffers scarcely any disturbance of spirit, but

---

[67] Harvey "*'Ishq*, *hesheq*, and *amor Dei Intellectualis*" in Steven Nadler (ed.), *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 96.
[68] *Guide*, III.51, p. 618. Pines, with reference to I Sam. 25:29, explains "bundle of life" to be referring to eternal life.
[69] EVp20s, *Works*, p. 373.

> being conscious, of a certain eternal necessity, of himself, of God and of things, never ceases to be, but always possesses true spiritual contentment.[70]

Though using starkly different terminology, this second passage from the EV makes a parallel series of connections between several parallel ideas to those in the one from the *Guide*. They both discuss the wise and free person, their knowledge of reality, i.e. of God, existence, and the self. They both identify this knowledge as their end. They also both discuss their comportment as a result of this knowledge, as well as the "eternal necessity" or "providence" of God and of things, which both constitutes a major part of the above requisite knowledge and leads to immortality, i.e. the eternal necessity of the self / being brought over to the "bundle of life." Formally, then, let alone in the broader strokes of the connections and ideas put forward, the similarities are already quite substantial.[71]

Maimonides continues the chapter with his famous parable of the ruler in his palace.[72] From outside the city walls, through the city gates, into the palace, and finally inside the ruler's inner courtyard in the palace, the citizens of the kingdom are situated in hierarchical strata of the palace and the surrounding city. On the first more obvious reading, the hierarchical strata of citizens around the King represent the full scope of humanity's relationship to God. At one end of the spectrum, the people furthest away from the city's center, or those perhaps closer but facing away from it, are completely ignorant of God, and, in the worst of cases, are deemed not even worthy of life.[73] On the other end of the spectrum, there are those who, after significant effort, focus and devotion, training and natural skill, attain to His inner courtyard. If those "coming into the inner part of the habitation… should make another effort, then they will be in the presence of the ruler,

---

[70] EVp42s, *Works*, p. 382.
[71] Waxman (1929), p. 413, argues that the whole arrangement of the *Ethics* parallels that of Saadia's and Maimonides' chief works, the *Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, and the *Guide*, respectively.
[72] *Guide* III.51, p. 618ff.
[73] *Guide*, III.51, p. 619.

see him from afar or from nearby, or hear the ruler's speech or speak to him."[74] Obviously, the closer one is to the King/God the better. On another reading, the hierarchical strata correspond to the hierarchy of the sciences. From the ignorant and opinionated, both wrongly and otherwise, from the obediently faithful to "those who have plunged into speculation concerning the fundamental principles of religion,"[75] from the rookies and initiated to the masters of the various scientific fields, from math and the natural sciences, all the way up to divine science, with all their gradations, the hierarchical strata lead through the full spectrum of human knowledge.[76] With "those who are present in the ruler's council … [representing] the rank of the prophets,"[77] seeing, hearing, or speaking with the ruler thus represent the heights of human intellectual achievement. The two readings, Maimonides informs us, are parallel.[78] This is insofar as "the bond between you and Him – that is, the intellect"[79] is "that intellect which overflowed from Him, may He be exalted, toward us [and] is the bond between us and Him."[80] Therefore, the more we know, the more we progress through the sciences, the more we perfect our intellects, in and through knowledge of God and existence, is proportional to how close we are to God and the strength of our bond with God. If we add to this the fact that our intellects just are "the divine intellect conjoined with man,"[81] then what we have here is a truly Spinozistic situation where the human mind just is a part of the divine

---

[74] *Guide*, III.51, p. 618.
[75] *Guide*, III.51, p. 619.
[76] *Guide*, III.51, p. 619.
[77] *Guide*, III.51, p. 620.
[78] Parallel is a given, but the exact correspondence is not clearly stated. Over the centuries, almost as soon as the *Guide* was "published" (by 1191, translated to Hebrew by Samuel ibn Tibbon by 1204), there has been near constant debate over the relative placement and rankings of scientists and philosophers vs. Rabbis, halakhists, and theologians, and the relationships between them all as presented in the parable. One essentially could not write a commentary on the *Guide* without offering and defending a full explanation of this parable and one's interpretation of the various rankings. For modern interpretations, Cf. Steven Harvey's "Maimonides in the Sultan's Palace" in *Perspectives on Maimonides* (1996), pp. 47-75, p. 62ff provide a clear list of the physical strata with (one reading of) the corresponding hierarchical interpretation of them, as well as the placement of the various sciences within the hierarchy; Menachem Kellner, *Maimonides on Human Perfection* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), esp. pp. 14ff.
[79] *Guide*, III.51, p. 620.
[80] *Guide*, III.51, p. 621. Also, III.52, p. 629.
[81] *Guide*, I.1, p. 23.

intellect, and where the more it knows then the larger a part of the divine intellect it becomes identical to. As Spinoza writes, "the human mind is part of the infinite intellect of God; and therefore when we say that the human mind perceives this or that, we are saying nothing else but this: that God…insofar as he constitutes the essence of the human mind – has this or that idea."[82] Thus, we have the 'intellectual' in Maimonides' concept of the intellectual love of God.

After explaining his parable, Maimonides turns to the question of how to strengthen our intellect or bond with God. It is in discussing the proper disposition for right training and worship on behalf of strengthening our intellect or bond with God that Maimonides mentions love, and presents us with his understanding of the intellectual *love* of God. To explain and emphasize the degree of devotion, commitment, and effort required for the highest levels of human existence, Maimonides quotes Deut. 11:13's call "to love the Lord your God, and to serve Him with all your heart and with all your soul." Expanding on what it means to love God, Maimonides then states that having "made it clear several times [, …] love is proportionate to apprehension."[83]

One of the chapters being referred to here by Maimonides is I.39, a lexicographical chapter defining "heart" / "*leb*." In it, Maimonides defines 'heart' variously as: "the principle of life of every being endowed with a heart," the middle of every thing, one's opinion, will, and, finally, intellect.[84] Offering an interpretation of Deut. 6.5 as clarification, Maimonides explains that "in this way heart is applied to the intellect," "all the forces of the body,"[85] and that "you should make His apprehension the end of all your actions."[86] The intellectual love of God, therefore, unifies all of one's faculties, physical and mental, towards the sole and ultimate end of knowing then loving,

[82] *Works*, EIIp11c, p. 250.
[83] *Guide*, III.51, p. 621. Pines notes I.39, to be taken up immediately, and III.28, the second of two chapters dedicated to the purposes of the Law and the opinions and beliefs it inculcates.
[84] *Guide*, I.39, pp. 88-9. It is interesting to note that on some interpretations of Maimonides, including my own, the will, intellect, "the principle of life of every [human] being endowed with a heart," and even opinions, if only the correct ones, can be seen as identical.
[85] Cf. Spinoza, EVp16's "all the affections of the body"
[86] *Guide*, I.39, p. 89.

loving then knowing, God, His governance,[87] and His acts,[88] i.e., existence, which both increases and buttresses our love and knowledge of God. As Maimonides states earlier in the *Guide*, *"Love becomes valid only through the apprehension of the whole of being as it is and through the consideration of His wisdom as it is manifest in it."*[89] *This last quotation, especially the claim that love becomes valid only through knowledge, can, in its striking similarity, be seen to foreshadow, if not influence, Spinoza's own highly intellectualist concept of ILG, as well as his distinction between the passive and active affects of love, with passive love being based in the imagination and thus false, and requiring reason and intuition to properly ground it in reality.*

*Let us return to III.51. A*fter Maimonides reviews the proper training regimen to "achieve this great end,"[90] and how Jewish law and ritual, when properly performed, have this as their end, He reflects on the paradigm example of Moses and the Patriarchs and identifies "apprehension of Him and Love of Him"[91] with union with God. As he states: "For in those four, I mean the Patriarchs and Moses our Master, union with God – I mean apprehension of Him and love of Him – became manifest." The explicit addition of union here only further reinforces the parallel with Spinoza discussed earlier, namely that the human mind, especially insofar as it knows, just is a part of the divine intellect.[92]

I*n order to more fully establish Maimonides' concept as the baseline for Spinoza's, certain other aspects of Maimonides' concept of ILG, specifically the role it plays in his philosophy and system as a whole, should be highlighted.*

Adding yet another equivalent proportion, Maimonides finds providence to be equally

---

[87] *Guide*, III.51, p. 620.
[88] *Guide*, III.51, p. 620. For what is meant by God's acts, or "actions proceeding from God," see: I.54.
[89] *Guide*, III:28, p. 512-3.
[90] *Guide*, III.51, p. 622ff.
[91] *Guide*, III.51, p. 624.
[92] Cf. KV II.23, *Works*, p. 95, "But if it becomes united with some other thing which is and remains unchangeable, then … it must also remain unchangeable and lasting. For, in that case, through what shall it be possible for it to perish?" & II. Preface, n. 15, *Works*, p. 61, "It [the soul] is a mode in the thinking substance it could also know, and love this [substance] as well as that of extension, and by uniting with substances (which remain always the same) it could make itself eternal."

proportional to our union with God, and thus also with our love and knowledge of God. As he states, "providence watches over everyone endowed with intellect proportionately to the measure of his intellect. Thus, providence watches over an individual endowed with perfect apprehension, whose intellect never ceases from being occupied with God."[93] This, in turn, creates a string of interdependent and mutually reinforcing proportional equivalencies between proper worship and service with love, love with knowledge, and all three with union or conjunction with God, which is what guarantees providence. The more one knows, then the more one loves. The more one loves, then the more one is able to duly train, worship, and serve, as one is properly motivated. The more one trains, worships, and serves, the more one is able to learn and know, and thus love, and back through the process again. The more one does all of the previous acts, the more fully one is able to commit their whole being to this end, the closer one is to God, the more one is united with God. Finally, when one has cleaved to God, one has guaranteed providence.

As mentioned previously, the intellectual love of God is humankind's telos, its end, its perfection. "Apprehension, total devotion to Him and the employment of intellectual thought in constantly loving Him should be aimed at,"[94] because *"…true human perfection consists in…conception of intelligibles, which teach true opinions concerning divine things. This is in true reality the ultimate end."*[95] Moreover, *"it is clear that the perfection of man that may truly be gloried in is the one acquired by him who has achieved, in a measure corresponding to his capacity, apprehension of Him, may He be exalted, and who knows his providence extending over His creatures as manifested in the act of bringing them into being and in their governance as it is."*[96]

Being humankind's ultimate and highest telos, all other human perfections, and even values, I would argue,

[93] *Guide* III.51, p. 624.
[94] *Guide*, III.51, p. 621.
[95] *Guide*, III.54, p. 635.
[96] *Guide*, III.54, p. 638.

are subordinated to it.[97] *"The perfection of the bodily constitution and shape… neither should this species of perfection be taken as an end… the perfection of the moral virtues… this species of perfection is likewise a preparation for something else and not an end in itself."*[98] *"The purpose of all actions prescribed by the Law … by all the particulars of the actions and through their repetition that some excellent men obtain such training that they achieve human perfection… the end of the actions prescribed by the whole Law is to bring about the passion of which it is correct that it be brought about… As for the opinions that the Torah teaches us – namely apprehension of His being and His unity, may He be exalted – these opinions teach us love."*[99] *Additionally, and reinforcing the subordination of all other human experience and action to ILG, "all [action prescribed by the Law] is not to be compared with this ultimate end and does not equal it, being but preparations made for the sake of this end."*[100] *As these quotations demonstrate, for Maimonides, everything, from one's physical health to one's morals, all of one's actions, religious rituals, and beliefs, all of one's existence and in fact existence* simpliciter*, is ultimately valued only with regards to the highest end of ILG. This, I will argue, is also true for Spinoza.*

The intellectual love of God, as mentioned earlier in our comparison of the opening passage of Guide *III.51 to certain passages in EV, aside from perfecting the individual, also leads with Maimonides, as with Spinoza, to immortality. "Apprehension of what He is… which is the end of man, and makes known to him how providence watches over him in this habitation until he is brought over to the bundle of life [i.e. immortality]."*[101] *"True human perfection…gives him permanent perdurance; through it man is man."*[102] *Or, as stated earlier in the* Guide*: One "should take as his end that which is the end of man qua man: namely, solely the mental representation of the intelligibles, the most certain and the noblest of which being the apprehension, in as far as this is possible, of God, of*

---

[97] Alexander Altmann, "Maimonides' Four Perfections" in *Essays in Jewish Intellectual History* (London: University Press of New England, 1981), pp. 65-76, discusses Maimonides' four perfections and their source in Ibn Bajja's *Letter of Farewell.*
[98] III.54, pp. 634-5.
[99] III.52, p. 629-30.
[100] III.54, p. 636.
[101] III.51, p. 618.
[102] III.54, p. 635.

the angels, and of His other works. These individuals are those who are permanently with God."[103] *The nature of Maimonides' particular conception of immortality or eternal existence was a controversial subject in the decades following the appearance of the* Guide.[104] *In modern scholarship the debate has re-phrased the topic to focus on Maimonides' exoteric and esoteric conceptions of immortality. In the end, however, according to the text, Maimonides' particular conception of immortality has much in common with Spinoza's conception of it (namely, the lack of memory and its impersonal nature, as well as its highly intellectualist basis) and is entirely dependent on ILG.*

Not only does ILG cause and promote immortality, however one interprets that concept, itself a controversial issue in Maimonides, the effects of ILG are certainly also felt and manifest in this life. Specifically, it guarantees providence, which results in a certain equanimity, stoic poise, or inner fortitude in the face of one's suffering, especially insofar as one understands God's wisdom in creation, including and especially in one's suffering. "A human being cannot be troubled in [such a state of happiness] by any of all the misfortunes."[105] *Maimonides' treatment of Job illustrates this rather well.*[106] *Offering us understanding and reflective distance from pain and suffering, ILG also causes pleasure or joy, true joy, eternal joy, or, to use Spinoza's words, a joy "without relation to the body." As Maimonides states, "true happiness is the knowledge of the deity."*[107] *To attribute the experience of pleasure to the intellect, especially intellect as separate from the body, and thus a non-corporeal pleasure, is a problem for both Maimonides and Spinoza. This problem also has a long history, reaching back to Aristotle.*[108] *That being said, and aware of the problem, Maimonides uses a different term for this non-corporeal intellectual love in III.51, namely* hesheq *(*חשק*), instead of* ahava *(*אהבה*), to differentiate it from bodily pleasure and love. These two concepts and terms have their parallel in Spinoza, namely the* amor *of EIII and* amor Dei intellectualis *of EV, as well as*

---

[103] III.8, p. 432-3.
[104] Cf.: Maimonides' *Treatise on Resurrection* as well as Ch. 4 "Hard Lessons for Slow Learners: Maimonides' *Treatise on Resurrection*" in Ralph Lerner, ed., *Maimonides' Empire of Light: Popular Enlightenment in an Age of Belief* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Aviezer Ravitzky, "'To the Utmost of Human Capacity': Maimonides on the Days of the Messiah" in Joel L. Kraemer, ed., *Perspectives on Maimonides* (London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1996), pp. 221-256; Daniel Silver, *Maimonidean Criticism and the Maimonidean Controversy, 1180-1240* (Dordrecht: Brill, 1965).
[105] Guide, III.23, pp. 492-3.
[106] Specifically, *Guide*, III.22, 23. "A human being cannot be troubled in it."
[107] Guide, III.23, p. 492.
[108] Harvey (2014), pp. 97-100, provides an excellent summary, with great notes, of this history.

Spinoza's 'laetitia' *and* 'beatitudo'.[109] *In tracing the similarities between Maimonides' and Spinoza's terminology, it is important to note that Harvey also identifies not only their respective uses of 'glory' (*כבוד*) in discussing ILG and its attendant joy, but their near identical use of Isaiah 58:8 as a proof text.*[110] *Thus, even with regards to their analysis of the emotional dimension of ILG, and especially in distinguishing it from other species of joy and love, Maimonides' position is strikingly similar to that of Spinoza.*

ILG also plays a major political function for Maimonides, as I will argue it does for Spinoza as well.[111] *In fact, just as with Spinoza, it both undergirds good government and is its end. Turning back to the paradigm of Moses and the Patriarchs, Maimonides states that in this "permanent state of extreme perfection in the eyes of God… their end was to come near to Him, may he be exalted; and how near! For the end of their efforts during their life was to bring into being a religious community that would know and worship God… Thus it has become clear to you that the end of all their efforts was to spread the doctrine of the unity of the name in the world and to guide people to love Him, may He be exalted."*[112] *From the archetypal example of Moses and the Patriarchs, Maimonides deduces the political motivation and its end. For, once one has attained perfection in ILG, to the extent that one can, one must endeavour to bring others up to such a state – in short, politics and civil service. Moreover, reflecting in the final chapter of the* Guide *on the uses of the term 'wisdom', Maimonides states that "the term wisdom is applied in Hebrew in four senses… [in the fourth sense,] it is applied to the aptitude for stratagems and ruses [*ha'arema ve-hatachbulah*],"*[113] *which, considering the proof texts cited in its support, clearly indicates a political, if Machiavellian notion of the political, understanding of the term. Therefore, in recognition of humanity's social dimension, the example of Moses and the Patriarchs adds an additional active, social, and ultimately political element to man's perfection – a*

[109] Harvey (2014).
[110] Harvey (2014), p. 105. Harvey here draws on his earlier 1999 Hebrew work on the canonical sources for glory in Maimonides and Spinoza.
[111] Howard Kreisel, *Maimonides' Poltical Thought: Studies in Ethics, Law, and the Human Ideal* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1999).
[112] *Guide*, III.51, p. 624.
[113] III.54, p. 632

perfection previously deemed to be thoroughly individualistic,[114] *and purely intellectual. While some scholars have argued that this additional political end in fact replaces the intellectual end as man's highest and ultimate perfection,*[115] *I find Harvey's argument that the political end is an overflow of the exceedingly perfect in perfecting others, reflecting (intellectual) perfection, not being identical to perfection, to be extremely persuasive. This is in large part because it does not completely do away with the rationalist project contained in the* Guide*, as the more skeptical reading would have us do, and it maintains the consequential analogy between us, our knowledge, and politics, and God, His knowledge, and his rule over all of existence.*[116]

To fully detail Maimonides' concept of ILG, there is also the question of the connection between ILG and our bodies. For, while our bodies, and all its faculties, are necessary in our acquisition of knowledge, the joy resulting from ILG is a uniquely non-bodily, non-physical state. As Maimonides states, after yet more effort and devotion, due to the "great joy in that which [they've] apprehended,"[117] one can even attain to a kind of transcendent meditative state where "all the gross faculties in the body cease […] to function."[118] Furthermore, with even more training and worship, nearly synonymous terms for Maimonides here, one can achieve "a state in which he talks with people and is occupied with his bodily necessities while his intellect is wholly turned toward Him, may He be exalted, so that in his heart he is always in His presence, may He be exalted, while outwardly he is with people."[119]

Finally, there is the genitive construction of ILG, God's intellectual love, something that

---

[114] *Guide* III.51, p. 621, "Mostly this is achieved in solitude and isolation. Hence every excellent man stays frequently in solitude and does not meet anyone unless it is necessary."
[115] Pines, "Limitations of Reason in Alfarabi, Ibn Bajja, and Maimonides." Josef Stern's *The Matter and Form of Maimonides' Guide* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2013) picks up on and develops a certain reading of Pines' skeptical reading.
[116] Warren Zev Harvey, "Maimonides on Human Perfection, Awe, and Politics" in Ira Robinson, Lawrence Kaplan, & Julien Bauer (eds.), *The Thought of Moses Maimonides: Philosophical and Legal Studies* (Lewiston, NY.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), pp. 1-15.
[117] *Guide*, III.51, p. 620.
[118] *Guide*, III.51, p. 620.
[119] *Guide*, III.51, p. 623.

comes up in Spinoza's discussion of ILG. Regarding this issue, one would expect Maimonides, especially in light of his well-developed negative theology, to perhaps deny God's love. However, insofar as we, or at least our minds, just are a part of God's intellect, or unified with it, then, much as with Spinoza, we can say that "the mind's intellectual love toward God is the love of God wherewith God loves himself… that is, the mind's intellectual love towards God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself,"[120] or that "the love of God toward men and the mind's intellectual love toward God are one and the same."[121] To put it into a Maimonidean idiom: "For through knowing the true reality of His own immutable essence, He also knows the totality of what necessarily derives from all His acts."[122] "Therefore every benefit that comes from Him, may he be exalted, is called *hesed* [loving-kindness]… Hence this reality as a whole – I mean that He, may He be exalted, has brought it into being – is *hesed*"[123] and thus "knowledge of My attributes, by which he means His actions (I:54)… those actions that ought to be known and imitated are loving-kindness, judgement, and righteousness."[124]

I deem it valid to say that the wealth of parallels listed and discussed above are more than can be explained away. They are deep and thoroughgoing, and extend to every aspect of ILG in both Maimonides and Spinoza. Moreover, while several of the ideas may have been sourced elsewhere, the sheer abundance of parallels, the similarity of argumentation, terminology, and even proof texts cited in support, confirms a solid and decisive influence of Maimonides on every facet of Spinoza's concept of ILG.[125] Maimonides' concept of ILG has thus been presented as baseline.

---

[120] EVp36, *Works*, p. 378.
[121] EVp36c, *Works*, p. 378.
[122] III.21, p. 485.
[123] III.53, p. 631
[124] III.54, p. 637
[125] Harvey (2014), p. 107.

II.B. The Concept of the Love of God in Crescas' *Or Adonai* (Light of the Lord).

II.B.i. The Connection.

The connection between Crescas[126] and Spinoza has far less textual evidence for its corroboration than the connection between Maimonides and Spinoza. There is but one explicit reference to "a certain Jew named Rab Chasdai [Crescas]" in Spinoza's entire corpus.[127] The connection between the two thinkers is thus immediately less obvious and, *prima facie*, more contentious. Nevertheless, as several scholars have shown, some to be discussed below, and as I will argue immediately thereafter, but specifically with regards to ILG, the connection between Crescas and Spinoza is substantial and thoroughgoing, if tougher to detect.

Generally speaking, the history of our scholarly understanding of the connection between Crescas and Spinoza loosely traces that of our understanding of the connection between Maimonides and Spinoza discussed in the previous sub-chapter (2.A), itself part and parcel of the broader connection between Spinoza and medieval Jewish thought. Having been published in the *OP* (1677), the work – a letter – containing the lone reference corroborating the connection between Crescas and Spinoza was and continues to be read, referenced, and used to better elucidate Spinoza's philosophy.[128] The relevance, on the other hand, of the reference to Crescas within the letter, over

---

[126] Hasdai Crescas (~1340-1410). We have little biographical information on Crescas. He was a Rabbi and communal leader in Saragossa and for all Aragonese Jewry, as well as a witness to the massacres and forced conversions that roiled through the Jewish communities of Spain in 1391. Harvey (1973), pp. 10f, cites Baer's *History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, Vol. II, 110-30. Cf. p. 523, s.v. Hasdai, Crescas.

[127] Ep. XII, olim XXIX, *Works*, pp. 787-791. The reference itself is found towards the end of the letter, on p. 791. The letter is addressed to Lodewijk Meyer, dated to 1663.

[128] Much of the scholarly literature on Spinoza's concepts of infinity and eternity, as well as other concepts directly dependent on those, draws on Ep. XII. Melamed (2014), p. 205: "[Ep. XII] is one of our most valuable texts for understanding the core of his ontology."

The letter seems to have had quite a life of its own. Referred to as "the Letter on the Infinite" among Spinoza's friends, it was still being cautiously disseminated by him but a year (1676) before his death (*Ep.* 80, *Works*, p. 955). Leibniz, whose copy of the original letter informs our translations and understanding of it, made great use of it. Much of German Idealism, up to and beyond Hegel, was influenced by its conception of the infinite. For discussions delineating its influence, Cf. *Spinoza and German Idealism* , eds. Forster & Melamed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Eckart Forster, *The Twenty-Five Years of Philosophy*, trans. by Brady Bowman (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012);

and above Spinoza's understanding of the infinite expounded on therein, is more often than not either ignored or undermined, the motivations for which go little further than a disregard for the question of sources or a conscious attempt to disconnect Spinoza from his Jewish sources for the sake of personal ideological refinement.[129] As some scholars, however, became interested in Spinoza's Jewish sources, especially his connection to medieval Jewish philosophy, and delved deeper into the Maimonidean connection, they naturally made the occasional reference to Crescas, the pre-Spinoza arch-critic of Maimonides, as well. As the Maimonidean connection was more robustly substantiated, scholars, seeking to better understand the extent of the importance of medieval Jewish thought and Judaism, and not just Maimonides, for Spinoza's thought, selected Crescas and the question of his importance for Spinoza as a natural follow up pursuit. Technically recognized for over a century and a half,[130] the serious historical analysis of the connection between Crescas and Spinoza has its roots in the extensive archival work of the progenitors and proponents of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* movement. Informed by the goals of the movement – to demonstrate the rich profundity, vitality, and universal importance of the history of Jewish thought[131] – several of Rabbi Dr. Manuel Joel's pioneering works of the late 19th c. deserve mention. Joel's work on Crescas' philosophy of religion,[132] which effectively revived the almost forgotten

---

Frederick Beiser, *German Idealism: The Struggle against Subjectivism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), esp. pp. 350ff; Frederick Beiser, *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).

129 Kuno Fischer, *Geschichte der Neueren Philosophie*, Vol. II (Heidelberg: 1901), pp. 265-73. Sir Frederick Pollock, *Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy* (London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1880), pp. 114f.

130 Harvey (1973), p. 6: "it has been the consensus of historians of Jewish philosophy since the second half of the nineteenth century that Crescas influenced Spinoza more than did any other Jewish philosopher, excepting Maimonides – and some would not recognize even this one exception." Harvey then mentions Samuel David Luzzatto's *Dibre Kohelet* (1860) as his earliest source on the connection between Crescas and Spinoza.

131 Leopold Zunz' *Etwas über die rabbinische Litteratur*. (Berlin: Maurersche Buchhandlung, 1818) laid out the intellectual agenda for the movement.

132 Manuel Joel, *Don Chasdai Creskas' Religionsphilosophische Lehren in Ihrem Geschichtlichen Einflusse Dargestellt* (Breslau: Schletter'sche Buchhandlung, 1866). Joel here discusses the ideas of Spinoza on several occasions (pp. 9f, 22f, 37ff, 44, 54ff), though mostly in the notes, and focusing on the influence of Crescas on Spinoza's conception of the infinite and his concept of ILG.

Crescas in introducing him to the non-Hebrew reading world,[133] spurred his own interest in Spinoza, whom he found essential for the dissemination of Jewish ideas into the modern (Christian) world. This interest in Spinoza resulted in respective works on Spinoza's *TTP*,[134] and KV,[135] the manuscript of which had only recently been discovered. All three of these works by Joel indicate numerous points of contact between the philosophies of Crescas and Spinoza. In his systematic examination of all twenty chapters of Spinoza's *TTP*, Joel finds Crescas' influence to be substantial, especially in the first third or so of the *Treatise*. Relevant for our present purposes: in Chs. 4 and 7 of the *TTP*, chapters dealing with divine law and biblical hermeneutics, respectively, it is Crescas' concept of the love of God, as the source and goal of divine law, as well as the guiding principle of proper biblical hermeneutics, that Joel argues to be of paramount importance for and influence on Spinoza.[136] As he states in the forward to the work, "From Chasdai [Crescas] comes the 'love,' from Maimonides the epithet 'intellectual.'"[137]

At the turn of the 20th c., and as the devotees and motivations of the *Wissenschaft des Judentum* movement moved west, insightful works by Neumark and Waxman followed up on Joel's work on Crescas and sought to, *inter alia*, further demonstrate, or, as in the case of Waxman, nuance and clarify the issue of, Crescas' influence on Spinoza.[138]

In line with the ideological motivations of Joel and the *Wissenschaft des Judentum* movement as to the importance of Spinoza, specifically, and Jewish literature and philosophy, generally, for the

---

133 Isidore Singer, Cyrus Adler (eds.), *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, Vol. 9 (London: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1904), p. 209. Harvey (1973), p. 2.
134 Manuel Joel, *Spinoza's Theologisch-Politischer Traktat auf seine Quellen geprüft* (Breslau: Schletter'sche Buchhandlung, 1870).
135 Manuel Joel, *Zur Genesis Der Lehre Spinoza's Mit Besonder Berucksichtigung Des Kurzen Traktatis "Von Gott, Dem Menschen Und Dessen Gluckseligkeit"* (Breslau: Jewish Theological Seminar, 1871).
136 Joel (1870), pp. 42ff & 60ff.
137 Joel (1870) p. x (translation mine).
138 David Neumark's "Crescas and Spinoza: A Memorial Paper in Honor of the Five hundredth Anniversary of the 'Or Adonai'" in *Year Book of the Central Conference of American Rabbis* (Cincinnati: S. Rosenthal & Co., 1909), pp. 277-319; Meyer Waxman, *The Philosophy of Don Hasdai Crescas* (NY: Columbia University Press, 1920).

"literature of the world," Neumark aims to introduce "a new feature in Spinoza's dependence on Crescas."[139] This feature, namely a distinctly Crescasian theory of dogmas,[140] is taken by Neumark to be "the only [viewpoint] from which this book [the *TTP*] can be successfully analyzed and adequately understood,"[141] and establishes, contra Joel, the influence of Crescas on Spinoza as no mere subsidiary to that of Maimonides'.[142] Analyzing the role of dogma in the two thinkers, Neumark argues for the "strong influence of Crescas upon Spinoza"[143] in this regard, and, in turn, far beyond. Mapping both Spinoza's general understanding of dogma and Spinoza's list of universal dogmas of faith from Ch. 14 of the *TTP*[144] onto his prior presentation of Crescas' theory and list of dogmas, Neumark states that "there is no room for any doubt that Spinoza while writing his *Tractatus* [*Theologico-Politicus*] had the book of "Or Adonai" (probably the editio princeps, Ferrara 1555) open before him on his desk!"[145] and holds the bold "thesis that Spinoza took the plan for the *Tractatus* [*Theologico-Politicus*] out of the book of Crescas."[146] The numerous parallels indicated and

---

[139] Neumark, p. 277.
[140] Neumark, pp. 280-296. Neumark grounds his exposition of Crescas' theory of dogmas in and from Crescas' critique of Maimonides (and Gersonides to a lesser extent). Cf. pp. 281, 283, for example. For more on Crescas' theory of dogmas, see: Menachem Kellner, *Dogma in Medieval Jewish Thought: From Maimonides to Abravanel* (Portland: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2004), Ch. 4, pp. 108-139; Seymour Feldman, *Philosophy in a Time of Crisis: Don Isaac Abravanel: Defender of Faith* (NY: Routledge, 2003), pp. 14-17.
[141] Neumark, p. 278.
[142] For a comparative analysis of Spinoza's theory of dogmas which makes no reference to Crescas, but is instead grounded in a comparison with Maimonides, see: Arthur Hyman, "Spinoza's Dogmas of Universal Faith in the Light of their Medieval Jewish Background" in Alexander Altmann (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 183-195. Hyman's exclusive focus on Maimonides would seem to undermine Neumark's claims on behalf of Crescas. However, the fact that Crescas' theory and list of dogmas is developed in and through a critical analysis of Maimonides' (and Gersonides') philosophies assuages this concern to no small extent. For, insofar as Spinoza draws on Crescas, who himself draws on or critiques Maimonides, and insofar as those aspects overlap in Spinoza, then one can say that Spinoza depends on Maimonides, both independently and in and through Crescas. As Neumark (p. 308) states: "even when using other Jewish sources Spinoza did not weave the ideas taken therefrom into the thread of his own discussion until after he had controlled the final touch they received while passing the brain of Crescas." Moreover, this chain of dependence can be seen to support the argument for a distinctive vein in (Jewish) intellectual history (of dogma) – one with Maimonides *and Spinoza* at the poles, and with Crescas in the middle – the existence of which only strengthens the claims and arguments, some of which are to be found in this present work, on behalf of the necessity and importance of medieval Jewish thought for a more complete understanding of Spinoza, and the latter's dependence on the former.
[143] Neumark, p. 318.
[144] *Works*, pp. 517-8.
[145] Neumark, p. 299f.
[146] Neumark, p. 307 (italics mine).

discussed by Neumark include: their respective definitions and discussions of prophecy,[147] selection,[148] miracles,[149] and the dogma of repentance,[150] the inclusion of which as a special dogma is unique to Crescas in the history of Jewish philosophy, and which thereby indicates, for Neumark, Crescas' influence on Spinoza's discussion thereof. This leads Neumark to find the basic structure and content of Chs. 1-3 of the *TTP* to be drawn straight from Crescas *Light of the Lord* II.4.[151] Though admitting of parallels, and even lines of influence between the thought of Crescas and Spinoza's *Ethics*, Neumark focuses almost exclusively on the *TTP* for his study.[152] If we accept the intimate connection between the *TTP* and the *Ethics* discussed earlier in the sub-chapter on Maimonides, then we now have yet even stronger reason to expect parallels between Crescas and Spinoza's *Ethics*, in the rest of his mature philosophy, as well. In reflecting on this very possibility at the end of his comparative study, Neumark finds that "the *philosophic system* of Spinoza springs from the system of Crescas"[153], arguing that "the three omissions [by Spinoza] in the enumeration of dogmas [namely: the divine attribute of extension, the eternity of existence, and absolute determinism; themselves developed in and through Spinoza's reading of Crescas] are three open doors leading from Spinoza's doctrine of dogmas into his philosophic system… [and] form the three basic principles of the system of Spinoza in his "Ethices" [sic]."[154] Moreover, observes Neumark, "the two standard works of Spinoza, both taken together, and considered in their relation to the book "Or Adonoi" [sic] *present the two manners of argumentation of Crescas. The "Tractatus" is built on the ground of Crescas' commonsense and biblical argumentation, the "Ethices" [sic] on that of his philosophic*

[147] Neumark, p. 308f.
[148] Neumark, p. 310.
[149] Neumark, p. 312.
[150] Neumark, p. 314f.
[151] Neumark, p. 307.
[152] Neumark, pp. 317-19, does end his paper with a brief discussion of the ramifications of his understanding of the dependence of Spinoza's *TTP* on Crescas for our understanding of Spinoza's system or mature philosophy generally and its dependence on Crescas. This will be discussed shortly.
[153] Neumark, p. 317 (original italics).
[154] Neumark, p. 318.

argumentation."[155]

In his probing 1920 study of Crescas, Waxman is primarily concerned with an exposition of Crescas' philosophy. Insofar as he additionally "intends to point out the mental proximity between Crescas and that great Jewish thinker Spinoza,"[156] Waxman refers to most of the Spinozan corpus, drawing on the *CM*, the *KV*, the *Ethics*, and the *TTP* in his comparative analyses. Far more cautious than Neumark in his ascriptions of influence, Waxman holds a middle ground between Joel's (and, though not mentioned, perhaps Neumark's) "exaggerated"[157] claims of influence and Fischer's denial of all influence. In discussing Crescas' proofs for God's existence and the attribute of unity, God's omniscience and providence, providence and free will, teleology, and the divine will and creation, chapters 2, 4-7, respectively, Waxman frequently reflects on the points of contact between the ideas of Crescas and Spinoza on these issues. In each instance, Waxman identifies the similarities, but is also keen to identify where Crescas and Spinoza diverge, ultimately arguing that "in general, I wish to say that I do not intend to minimize the influence of Crescas upon Spinoza. On the contrary, I believe that both systems afford many points of contact, and, furthermore, that their source is really one,[158] except that they run in divergent lines. It is possible to find a goodly number of likenesses, but they are never commensurable."[159] Thus, we have numerous passages throughout Waxman's work that both assert, or come close to asserting influence, but which also stress the ultimate lack of complete identity between their respective conceptions and understandings of the issues. For example: "in spite of the widely separating gulf between the two systems, there is still a marked similarity in the basic conception of the attributes. Both teach infinite perfection, infinite unity in

[155] Neumark, p. 318 (original italics).
[156] Waxman, p. 26.
[157] Waxman, p. 77.
[158] Namely, an understanding of things as strictly determined.
[159] Waxman, p. 79.

spite of the positive content of the attributes, and the incomplete knowledge of the essence;"[160] "it is only religious sufficiency that prevented Crescas from following up his own definition and reaching the same conclusion [as Spinoza];"[161] "but still the kinship of the teaching cannot be denied;"[162] regarding the love of God, "in spite of their divergence there are some points of contact. Both systems have perfection for their basis. Crescas as well as Spinoza asserts that the love of God is intimately connected with perfection, and the more perfect a man is the higher the love of God; and, moreover, perfection in both systems has a background of reality. Again, according to both of them, the love of God is a means to obtain immortality;"[163] and, finally, "up to a certain point these two thinkers go together, but later they part company."[164] Generally speaking, Waxman relies on a strong reading of Crescas' distinction between the (divine and human) will and the (divine and human) intellect in order to differentiate Crescas from Spinoza. Despite the supposed fundamental difference regarding their respective conceptions of the will, a reading some scholars and I don't fully agree with, and which will come up below when we turn to Crescas himself, Waxman nevertheless finds a common core between the two thinkers, arguing that "they afford points of similarity, especially at the base of their systems where the variance is at its minimum. It can almost be said that Spinoza's system is only a result of carrying out Crescas's [sic] principles to their extreme logical conclusion,"[165] whereas "Crescas really never followed the logical conclusions to the extreme, but always turned off at an angle."[166] This idea, that Spinoza followed Crescas' principles to their logical conclusion, has since been maintained by several scholars.[167] If we add to this even a minor

[160] Waxman, p. 73.
[161] Waxman, p. 74.
[162] Waxman, p. 114.
[163] Waxman, p. 149.
[164] Waxman, p. 156.
[165] Waxman, p. 73.
[166] Waxman, p. 124.
[167] This observation may in fact go back further, but it has become a common description of the relationship between the philosophies of Crescas and Spinoza. Cf. Feldman (1982), p. 21 n. 41; Fraenkel (2009), p. 84. Feldman (1984), pp. 21,

consideration of the respective circumstances of these two thinkers – the one deeply troubled by the unstable philosophical foundations of his faith community and seeking to restore the primacy of the Law and secure the future of the faith, the other deeply troubled by the threat posed by superstitious theology to the sovereignty of reason; the one standing at the dusk of a particular world view, the other at the dawn of modern science and the Enlightenment – then many of the divergences can be seen as in part due not so much to their strength of mind, faith, or lack thereof, but due to their adequately meeting the needs of their times, responding to the dual challenges of faith and reason.

As with the case for Maimonides, and, in fact, for all of medieval Jewish philosophy, it was H.A. Wolfson who really introduced Crescas to English speaking scholars of Spinoza.[168] Having first applied his extreme erudition and philological skill to Crescas, Wolfson's *Crescas' Critique of Aristotle* (1929), a heady tome of over 700 pages, with an easy third of the volume consisting of highly detailed notes, argues for the historical importance of Crescas, in his critique of Aristotle and the reigning worldview that so depended on the Stagirite, for "an attempt to trace the history of certain problems of philosophy."[169] In this work, Wolfson occasionally argues for the influence of Crescas' *Or Adonai* on Spinoza,[170] specifically its critiques of Aristotle's concepts of time, matter or extension, the infinite, and his proofs for God's existence.[171] Spinoza's "entire discussion of the infinite,[172] both the restatement of the arguments against its existence and his refutation of these arguments, are

---

25, prefers to state that Crescas "anticipates" Spinoza. Fraenkel (2009), pp. 101-3, discusses certain "ontological constraints" that prevented Crescas from proceeding further with his own principles as Spinoza did, specifically: that bodies are composed of matter and form.

168 As with scholars of Crescas, Neumark and Waxman are almost never referenced by scholars of Spinoza. When speaking of the connection between the two, scholars of Spinoza are sufficed with Wolfson, and leave Joel in the footnotes. Also to be mentioned, but in the French speaking world: Pierre Duhem, *System du Monde*, Vol. V (1917), pp. 229-232, who, Harvey informs us (1998, p 25, n. 76), writing before Wolfson's translation, and unable to read Hebrew, based his work off of Joel's *Don Chasdai Creskas' religionsphilosophische Lehren* (1866). Harvey (1973), p. 8, discusses Neumark, and is a rarity. Harvey locates the present lack of discussion on the relationship between Spinoza's *TTP* and Crescas to Neumark's thorough if sometimes overstated study.

169 Wolfson (1929), p. vii.

170 Wolfson (1929), pp. 97, 654; 120; 36-7, respectively.

171 I.1.3; I.2.3. It should be noted that in critiquing Aristotle's conceptions of such key concepts and proofs, Spinoza was able to apply those same critiques to much of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition so dependent on the Stagirite.

172 For Spinoza's discussion of the infinite, aside from Ep. XII, see: EID2, 6, 8, *Works*, pp. 217f.

directly based upon Crescas" because "there are certain intrinsic difficulties in Spinoza's presentation of the views of his 'opponents' which could not be cleared up unless we assumed that he had drawn his information from Crescas."[173] Wolfson's *The Philosophy of Spinoza* (1934), the monumentality of which bears repeating, further develops the connections posited in his 1929 work, and suggests Crescas as a source for much of Spinoza's philosophy – including both his early and mature philosophy, as found especially in the *KV*, and in the *Ethics* and the *TTP*, respectively.[174] From Spinoza's geometric method,[175] arguments for God's unity[176] and existence,[177] the attributes of God, generally,[178] and the attribute of extension, specifically,[179] to Spinoza's conceptions of time, duration, and eternity,[180] as well as love, love of God, God's love,[181] and even immortality,[182] Wolfson finds Crescas' influence almost everywhere in Spinoza. According to Wolfson, the main point of contact is to be found in Spinoza's use of and dependence on Crescas' arguments against the Aristotelian conception of the infinite and its corresponding denial of an actual infinite magnitude, as well as Crescas' own resulting conception of the infinite, and its corresponding affirmation of an actual infinite magnitude, which informs Spinoza's proofs for God's existence,[183] and his attributing extension to God. Though supplying much fodder, some meatier than others, for the intellectual historian, or scholar of Spinoza or Crescas, the same methodological shortcomings discussed previously in the section on Maimonides[184] limit the persuasiveness of the myriad connections and

---

[173] Wolfson (1929), p. 37.
[174] Also, see: H. A. Wolfson, "Spinoza on the Infinity of Corporeal Substance" in *Chronicon Spinozanum*, Vol. 4, 1924-26, pp. 85-101. This paper was integrated into his 1934 work.
[175] I, pp. 41f
[176] I, pp. 82f
[177] I, pp. 161, 195-7
[178] I, pp. 225, 229
[179] I, pp. 223, 235, 275-81, 290-295
[180] I, pp. 338, 341f, 346, 353ff, 363
[181] II, pp. 276-284
[182] II, pp. 289, 317-325
[183] Especially those proofs found in EIp15.
[184] P. 61 above.

claims of influence put forward by Wolfson in his penetrating study of Spinoza.[185] The general thrust of his comparison, however, that, generally speaking, Crescas can be seen to have influenced Spinoza, cannot be denied.

The paucity of scholars who have since pursued and developed Wolfson *et al*'s numerous assertions of influence of Crescas on Spinoza is regrettably even more drastic than in the case of the scholars concerned with the connection between Maimonides and Spinoza. The reasons for this are several. Chief amongst them is the relative importance and popularity of Maimonides in comparison to Crescas for both lay Jewish and scholarly circles. Unlike Maimonides, Crescas never commented on or codified the whole of Jewish law, he never produced a work of Biblical exegesis,[186] and his work was not subject to almost a millennium of more or less constant study and commentary. He was no Great Eagle. Additionally, there was no Leo Strauss to reinvigorate a whole field of study dedicated to him.[187] The paucity is also due in part to the fact that Crescas' ideas and philosophy are couched in a thoroughgoing critique of Maimonides' and Gersonides' interpretations of Aristotle – his philosophy, his theory of the Acquired Intellect,[188] his concepts of space, time, place, and vacuum,[189] just to name a few critical issues – itself understood through the lens of Averroes, The Great Commentator, thus requiring extensive exposure to and intimate knowledge of the history of

---

[185] II. pp. 374/5, s.v. Crescas, Hasdai.

[186] Though he does comment and interpret numerous passages throughout his *Or Hashem*, which is replete with biblical and rabbinic passages, as are his other smaller works.

[187] Anecdotally, Shlomo Pines, the great scholar and translator of the *Guide*, was once asked about the future of Maimonidean studies and answered: "There is Leo Strauss." Cf. Kenneth Green, *Leo Strauss on Maimonides: The Complete Writings* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), which has the relevant writings of Strauss on Maimonides; Ibid., *Leo Strauss and the Rediscovery of Maimonides* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013); ibid., *Jew and Philosopher: The Return to Maimonides in the Jewish Thought of Leo Strauss* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1993); Warren Zev Harvey, "How Strauss Paralyzed the Study of the 'Guide of the Perplexed' in the Twentieth Century" in *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 50, 2001, pp. 387-396; Hillel Fradkin, "Philosophy and Law: Leo Strauss as a Student of Medieval Jewish Thought" in *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (Winter 1991), pp. 40-52; Aryeh Tepper, *Progressive Minds, Conservative Politics: Leo Strauss's Later Writings on Maimonides* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2013).

[188] Harvey (1973).

[189] For an excellent schematic overview of Crescas' critique of certain central concepts of Aristotle's, e.g., place, vacuum, motion, time, see: James T. Robinson, "Hasdai Crescas and anti-Aristotelianism" in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 391-413.

Greek, Islamic, and Jewish philosophy, as well as deft philological skill in several languages to engage and extract Crescas' true position on any given issue. Nevertheless, a few scholars have since embarked on this difficult task and have rather successfully argued for and developed our understanding of several key parallels between Crescas and Spinoza over and above those made explicit in Ep. XII, or discussed by Wolfson *et al*, as discussed above.

In the last half century or so, there is perhaps no other scholar who has written on Crescas more and has done more for our understanding of Crescas than Warren Zev Harvey.[190] Beginning with his 1973 Dissertation on *Hasdai Crescas' Critique of the Theory of the Acquired Intellect*, followed up by his 1998 book on *Physics and Metaphysics in Hasdai Crescas*,[191] a 2010 Hebrew volume on Crescas,[192] and a common presence in many of his smaller writings in between,[193] our contemporary scholarly understanding of the philosophy of Crescas, as well as its relationship to that of Maimonides, medieval Jewish thought, and even Spinoza, owes much to Harvey's work and insight. Though focused on presenting the basic components of Crescas' philosophy, Harvey's 1998 volume affords us a few scattered sections comparing the thought of Crescas and Spinoza.

Discussing a particular passage from Crescas' *Light of the Lord*,[194] wherein Crescas refers to the rabbinic dictums of "Blessed be the Place," and "He is the Place of the world,"[195] Harvey,

---

[190] Though the connection to Spinoza is relegated mostly to the notes, and thus not immediately relevant to our purpose here, several probing studies by Seymour Feldman should also be mentioned: Seymour Feldman, "Crescas' Theological Determinism" in *Daat: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah*, No. 9 (1982), pp. 3-28; Ibid., "The Theory of Eternal Creation in Hasdai Crescas and Some of His Predecessors" in *Viator*, Vol. 11 (1980): pp. 289-320; Ibid., "A Debate Concerning Determinism in Late Medieval Jewish Philosophy" in *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*, Vol. 51 (1984): pp. 15-54.

[191] Warren Zev Harvey, *Physics and Metaphysics in Hasdai Crescas* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1998).

[192] Warren Zev Harvey, *R' Hasdai Crescas* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 2010.

[193] Just to name a few: Warren Zev Harvey, "The Term *Hitdabbekut* in Crescas' Definition of Time," in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 71, No. 1 (July 1980): pp. 44–47; Ibid., "Kabbalistic Elements in Crescas' *Light of the Lord*" in *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* Vol. 2, No. 1 (1982-3): pp. 75-109 (Hebrew); Ibid., "Crescas vs Maimonides on Knowledge and Pleasure," in *A Straight Path: Studies in Medieval Philosophy and Culture: Essays in Honor of Arthur Hyman* (The Catholic University of America Press, 1988), pp. 113–23; Ibid., "Knowledge of God in Aquinas, Judah Romano, and Crescas," in *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought: Joseph Baruch Sermoneta Memorial Volume* (1998), pp. 223–28.

[194] *Or*, I.2.1.

[195] bAZ 40b and Genesis Rabbah 68:9, respectively. Cited by Harvey (1998), p. 28, n. 85, 86.

finding Spinoza to have taken Crescas' metaphorical explanation of the passage literally, asserts that "it does indeed seem that the passage made an impression on Spinoza."[196] In discussing Crescas' proof for God's existence, and Spinoza's citation of it in his *Letter on Infinity* (Ep. XII), Harvey, ambivalent on the issue of whether Spinoza had Crescas before him or simply recalled an impactful statement from his youth, finds that while "Spinoza does not endorse Crescas' proof," Spinoza's own version of the demonstration, in EIp11 second demonstration, "is clearly indebted in some measure to Crescas."[197] In discussing Crescas' concept of God as one of joy and love, in contra-distinction to the Aristotelian God of intellect, Harvey identifies several parallels between Crescas and Spinoza. These will be discussed and integrated below, but for now, finding love to be a species of joy for Crescas, a transitive one that takes a direct object, Harvey recalls Spinoza's definition of love as "joy accompanied by the idea of an external cause," as comparable.[198]

Towards the end of the section on Crescas' God of joy and love, it may be interesting to note that Harvey compares Crescas' *Or Adonai* with Judah Abarbanel's *Dialoghi d'Amore*,[199] whose connection to Spinoza and concept of ILG will be the subject of the next sub-chapter below (II.C). Citing a particular passage from part III of the *Dialoghi* that discusses the distinction between love and pleasure qua act vs. qua passion, and God's love for and pleasure in His creation,[200] Harvey argues that its contents "reflect Crescas' discussion."[201] In light of its use of identical traditional proof texts,[202] it can even be said that it "testifies to his direct literary indebtedness to Crescas' discussion of God's joy in *Light*, I, 3, 5."[203] Moreover, applying a wider perspective to his

---

196 Harvey (1998), p. 30. Wolfson (1934), Vol I, p. 223.
197 Harvey (1998), p. 90. Wolfson (1934), Vol. I, pp. 195-99.
198 EIII, Definitions of the Affects, D6, *Works*, p. 312. Harvey (1998), p. 106.
199 Harvey (1998), pp. 114-117.
200 *Dialoghi*, pp. 456-7.
201 Harvey (1998), p. 114.
202 Psalms 104:31, Genesis 6:6, bKet 8a, identified by Harvey (1998), p. 114.
203 Harvey (1998), pp. 114-5. Guttman (1973), p. 296, arguing that the centrality of Abarbanel's concept and doctrine of love rests on Jewish foundations, and that that which distinguishes Abarbanel and the Jewish tradition from Plato and

comparative analysis, Harvey states that "regarding the metaphysical theory of love, one may trace a tradition from Avicenna (*Epistle on* 'Ishq) to Maimonides (*Guide*, III, 51), through Gersonides, Crescas, and Leone, and to Spinoza (*Ethics*, V, 32-37)."[204] I certainly agree, and intend this Chapter as a whole to help colour in some of what others have traced.

In turning to Crescas' determinism, Harvey finds Crescas' discussion of the issues of determinism and choice to have "influenced Spinoza."[205] Specifically, Crescas' distinction between a voluntary act done with appetite and imagination in harmony and an involuntary act done with appetite and imagination in disharmony is seen to portend, or significantly albeit partially parallel,[206] Spinoza's distinction between free and coerced actions in EID7.[207] According to another scholar, citing EIp26-33, "given his debt to Crescas on several matters, it would not be too farfetched to suggest that on this particular point [i.e. determinism, and that thinking things could be other than they are is wrong], Spinoza saw more perspicuously what Crescas' doctrine implied and clearly and consistently drew the conclusion."[208] Finally, in a brief concluding section on the expression "feeling of compulsion or restraint" found in *Light of the Lord*, II.5.3, Harvey argues that despite the linguistic similarity, both "philosophers hold that the volitions of an individual are necessitated by their causes, and they both speak about a situation in which the individual having the volition has no feeling of compulsion. Nonetheless, there is a decisive difference between their statements."[209] The difference being that Spinoza finds the absence of a feeling of compulsion or restraint, which for

---

Plotinus, namely that love proceeds not only from creatures to God, but from God to His creatures, unites him with Crescas, and, I would argue, with Spinoza. Cf. Leone Ebreo, *Dialogues of Love*, trans. Cosmos Damian Bacich & Rossella Pescatori (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), p. xii: "Ficino's Platonism, and perhaps some of Pico's idiosyncratic enthusiasms, are as evident as the ideas of Crescas on cosmic love [in Abarbanel's *Dialoghi*]. More on Abarbanel in Chapter II.C. below.

[204] Harvey (1998), p. 115.

[205] Harvey (1998), p. 137.

[206] Harvey (1998), p. 156.

[207] Harvey (1998), p. 144. Spinoza, *Works*, p. 217.

[208] Seymour Feldman, "Crescas' Theological Determinism" in *Daat: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah*, No. 9 (1982), p. 21 n. 41.

[209] Harvey (1998), p. 151.

Crescas indicates the voluntary nature of the act, to ultimately be an illusion, an imaginative error, and that all things, including all human actions, are determined. The illusion of human psychology aside, both their systems are fundamentally and radically deterministic.[210]

Finally, before we turn to Crescas himself, there are a couple works by Carlos Fraenkel and Yitzhak Melamed, respectively, two of the leadings scholars of Spinoza of the next generation who consider his Jewish sources generally and his dependence on Crescas specifically. Following up on a prior paper of his on a possible Pythagorean source for Crescas interpretation of the rabbinic dictum that "God is the place of the World,"[211] and along the familiar lines of Spinoza's having followed Crescas' principles further and to their logical end, Fraenkel argues that Crescas' interpretation of the rabbinic dictum that God is "the place of the world" "contributed to…Spinoza's decisive step beyond the Aristotelian doctrine of God, namely the integration of the attribute of extension into what Spinoza describes as the 'active essence' of God's infinite being (EII, Prop.3 Schol.)."[212] In one of Melamed's works on Spinoza, admitting that "similarities between Spinoza and Crescas, which suggest the latter's influence on the former, can be discerned in several other important issues, such as necessitarianism, the view that we are compelled to assert or reject a belief by its representational content, the enigmatic notion of *amor Dei intellectualis*, and the view of punishment as a natural consequent of sin," Melamed undertakes a comparative analysis of "Hasdai Crescas and Spinoza on actual infinity and the infinity of God's attributes."[213] Through a careful examination of the respective thinkers' positions on the concept of the infinite, their mutual acceptance of the possibility of an actual infinite, and how it informs their comparative understandings of God's

---

[210] For more on Crescas' determinism, see: Feldman (1982, 1984).
[211] Carlos Fraenkel, "From the Pythagorean Void to Crescas' God as the Place of the World" in *Zutot: Perspectives on Jewish Culture*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2008): pp. 87-94.
[212] Carlos Fraenkel, "Ḥasdai Crescas on God as the Place of the World and Spinoza's Notion of God as Res Extensa" in *Aleph: Historical Studies in Science and Judaism*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2009), p 82.
[213] Melamed in Nadler (ed.) 2014

having infinitely many attributes, Melamed, again along the familiar lines of seeing Spinoza as following Crescas' principles to their logical end, argues for a striking similarity in their thought on this issue and for viewing Crescas and Spinoza as key stops in the "thread in the development of the concept of the infinite."[214]

A more exhaustive discussion of the various points of contact between the philosophies of Crescas and Spinoza, and the scholarship on it, would take us too far afield from our present task. The general connection has been sufficiently demonstrated. Moreover, just as with Maimonides, the connections and parallels, the points of contact, between the philosophies of Crescas and Spinoza are numerous and substantial. They include, *inter alia*, similar conceptions of infinity, eternity, and time, as well as theories of dogma, which, taken as principles of their respective philosophies, led both thinkers to strikingly similar understandings of a strictly determinist existence and its relation to God as its infinite source and sustainer. Also included are their respective conceptions of ILG, to Crescas' of which we now turn.

II.B.ii. Crescas' Concept of the Love of God.

Crescas' concept of the love of God is subtle and tough to extract, but deceptively simple in the end. Though he "endeavours, seemingly, to escape the many stranded network of the peripatetic philosophy, […] he in reality is caught therein."[215] This is especially true regarding his concept of the love of God as his concept of the love of God stands on a well-reasoned if highly critical philosophy. In systematically dismantling the definitions and understandings of several concepts essential to Aristotelian philosophy, its world view, its conception of the deity, and in turn the Aristotelian philosophical framework that functioned as the basis for much of medieval Jewish

[214] Melamed, p. 214.
[215] David Neumark, "Crescas and Spinoza" (1909), p. 288.

thought – from ontology to epistemology, from hermeneutics to ethics, and everything in between which depends thereon – Crescas turns to the only authoritative source and voice he has left: Scripture and the rabbinic tradition of commentary thereon.[216]

Scripture and the rabbis, Crescas finds, are both quite clear that God has joy, and even sadness, that God loves.[217] While the Aristotelians claim their deity also experiences joy, their holding God to be pure intellect – the intellectually cognizing subject, object, and act of cognition – should in fact preclude them from consistently ascribing joy, or even desire (let alone sadness), to God. This is insofar as joy and sadness are passions of the animal voluntary soul and thus not to be found in a deity so conceived as pure intellect.[218] The philosophers are, according to Crescas, inconsistent in their conception. Moreover, even were joy to not be inconsistent with the Aristotelian God of pure intellect, it would impute a lack in the deity as well as slowly subside after the initial experience, both outright absurd impossibilities to be held of God. For, as understood by the philosophers, "the pleasure that we have in apprehension is in our bringing it out from potentiality into actuality,"[219] and is thus indicative of an initial lack in the one apprehending. Pleasure for us humans also varies based on the object of our apprehension, and quickly subsides thereafter.[220] "It is [thus] wholly improper to draw an analogy between our apprehension and His apprehension" or "from the pleasure we have in our apprehension, which is caused by the movement from ignorance to knowledge and by the new attainment of the cognition, to Him whose

---

[216] Robinson, p. 405: "Crescas argues that no positive knowledge of God can be had through philosophical means. Thus, turning from philosophy to Scripture, he sets out on a different path. Focusing on a few key biblical texts, and drawing upon his own peculiar conception of the universe, Crescas conceives of God not as a cause of motion, but as an infinite source of love. Creator of a beginningless universe, God fills this vast empty space with nothing but the good and rules it with nothing but joy. It is through love that God gave the law to Israel, and it is through love, expressed as obedience to the law, that Israel can cleave to and conjoin with God. This Crescas maintains, is the final purpose and ultimate reward of human existence."

[217] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), pp. 119-20. Psalm 104:31; bKet 8a; Genesis 6:6; Isaiah 63:10; Psalms 91:15 are just some of the passages referenced in the relevant discussions on love.

[218] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 120.

[219] 1.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 120.

[220] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 120/1.

intelligibilia are all *intelligibilia prima* always, with no movement or change or new attainment of apprehension."[221]

Having done away with the philosophical obstacles to his ascribing joy to God by showing the philosophers or their premises to be false, inconsistent, or otherwise no longer authoritative, and in line with the texts of tradition, Crescas simply affirms that "in His intentionally and voluntarily causing His goodness and perfection to overflow, He necessarily loves the increasing of goodness and the causing of His goodness to overflow… [and His] sustaining their existence continuously in the most perfect of ways."[222] Immediately thereafter, Crescas defines love as "nothing other than pleasure in the will, and this is the true joy,"[223] which, considering his earlier definition of joy as "nothing but the pleasure of the will,"[224] makes love a species, in fact the highest species, or highest form of joy.[225] Specifically, love is distinguished from joy as a transitive verb is distinguished from an intransitive verb, love takes a direct object.[226] Altogether, this allows Crescas to understand several biblical and rabbinic passages literally,[227] leading to an understanding of God as loving, loving His self, His causing and sustaining all of existence, as well as loving and even having "lusts" for our good deeds and thoughts, as well as our proper emotional response to them.[228] "We may now envision Crescas' infinite spatiotemporal universe as pulsing with love. Its infinite worlds are generated in love, sustained in love, and perfected in love."[229] "This agrees very well with what

[221] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), pp. 120, 121 (original italics).
[222] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 121. Cf. II.2.4: "God eternally brings forth and creates existent things through His will. And the will is nothing but the love of the willer for that which he wills" (translated by Feldman (1980), p. 309).
[223] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 121. Cf. II.6.1, Harvey (1998), pp. 124-33.
[224] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 119.
[225] Harvey (1998), p. 106.
[226] Harvey (1998), p. 106. Recall the earlier indicated similarity of this conception with that of Spinoza's.
[227] Psalms 104:31; bHul 60b; bYeb 64a; Deut 10:15; and others identified by Harvey (1998), pp. 119-133.
[228] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 121-2. Cf. II.6.1: "He loves the good, as may be seen from His actions in bringing into existence the entire universe, sustaining it perpetually, and continuously creating it anew" (Harvey (1998), p. 124).
[229] Harvey (1998), p. 113.

appears in the law"[230] since "it has been shown beyond doubt that rational speculation itself agrees with what has been established according to the Law and the tradition, namely that true love is what brings about this [ultimate] purpose, which is the eternal survival [of the soul]."[231]

We turn now to an analysis of the function of the love of God in Crescas' system. Scattered throughout his critique of Aristotle, Crescas offers us his positive philosophy in bits. Putting it together, it should come as no surprise that despite a few differences in his system in comparison with Spinoza's later, we find that the concept of the love of God in Crescas performs much the same functions as we found ILG to have performed in Maimonides, and as we will find in Abarbanel's *Dialoghi d'Amore* and especially Spinoza. We turn to these below.

Crescas is abundantly clear on the role the love of God is to play in our lives. In discussing the proportion that exists between the perfection of the lover and the degree of the good of the object loved, Crescas states that "it follows that the love for God, who is infinite good, is necessary for the greatest conceivable perfection of the soul," and that "true love is what brings about this [ultimate] purpose, which is the eternal survival [of the soul].[232] Thus, "it is clear that love and mutual attraction are the cause of their perfection and unity."[233] Moreover, "…the view according to the teachings of Scripture and tradition, namely, that true love is that which is conducive to the final end of the eternal remaining-in-existence of the soul […] is an accepted belief of our people…"[234] Finally, "What is essential to the perfection of the soul is… love"[235] and "…it must necessarily be that love of the good [which is God] is an essential property of perfection."[236]

Not only, though, is love the end, telos, and final cause, of human existence, it is the source

[230] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 124.
[231] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 126.
[232] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 126.
[233] Harvey (1998), p. 126.
[234] II.6.1.
[235] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 126.
[236] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 124 (Insert mine).

of and standard for all value. In interpreting Deut. 6:5, a familiar and crucial passage for the concept of ILG, Crescas states:

> "It is as if the entire intent [of the Law] is that all the thoughts of a person should be directed to this one purpose, namely, this love, as the Rabbis said: "Let all your actions be in the name of Heaven." One should thus not love anything except if it be for the purpose of this love"[237]

This means that all our desires, all our actions consequent thereon, even those directed at some other object or goal, should be pursued only with a view to the ultimate and really only value: the love of God.

Love also results in union with God, which God desires and enjoys. As Crescas states: "the most perfect good possible for a human being is to adhere unto God…and when this good is manifested in us, it is pleasurable for Him, and figuratively speaking, as it were, He lusts for it."[238] The unitive aspect of love extends far beyond the realm of the human, to inanimate things and the whole cosmos, "for even in the case of natural things it is clear that love and mutual attraction are the cause of their perfection and unity."[239] These two points, that our love of God is pleasurable to God, and that even the inanimate parts of the cosmos can be understood to participate in as well as exude and radiate love, bear striking resemblance to certain ideas in Spinoza, namely: that insofar as our love of God just is God's love of himself – as we are contained in and explained through His essence – then our love of God and the concomitant joy we experience just is God's love and joy; and that all modes, even so called inanimate things, consist of a mind and body, so a mode, whatever the mode, is capable of ILG, if it is capable of anything at all.

"Perfection of the soul and its adhesion unto God are worthy to bring about this [ultimate] purpose [namely, the eternal happiness of the soul]… true love is what brings about this [ultimate]

[237] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 130.
[238] I.3.5. Harvey (1998), p. 121/2.
[239] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 126

purpose, which is the eternal survival [of the soul]."[240] Thus, in addition to love causing joy, unity or adhesion to God, it also causes immortality. However, proper motivations are essential. Much as Spinoza declares regarding his concept of ILG, its boon for our existence, and its effecting the eternity of the mind, "this love should not be for the sake of the world to come. For if this love is for the sake of some other purpose, that purpose would necessarily be more loved."[241] This, according to both Crescas and Spinoza, would be wrong insofar as it could undermine the whole edifice built thus far and fail to afford the proper respect due to God. "True love, in Crescas' opinion, is not study but obedience, and obedience is measured not in the action per se but in the will and desire to achieve that act. Reward is the pleasure experienced in pursuing this higher desire, and this pleasure, according to Crescas, which is unique to each individual, survives after death in a self-subsistent soul that is eternal by nature. This, Crescas explains triumphantly, is humankind's reward."[242]

Crescas' political philosophy, at least as contained in *Or Adonai*, is by no means extensive, and really consists of a full hearted endorsement and spirited defense of Jewish Law. We do however get a relevant passage in his discussion of Moses, the master of prophets, and Law-giver of the Jewish people:

> "For the true servant and lover [of God], the purpose of his passionate love is the service. Such was the intent of the master of the prophets [sc., Moses]…For although he was certain of achieving eternal life and the delight in the radiance of His Indwelling [should he die forewith]. Yet it was fitting for him to desire *service*, even if there were an advantage for him in the separation of his soul. In addition, the more he would serve, the more the adhesion [unto God] would become great and increase. Be this as it may, the servant [of God] will desire naught but the service [of God], and this is the ultimate purpose of the commanded."[243]

In this passage it is clear that love leading to service, to God and to our fellow humans, i.e. politics,

[240] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 126.
[241] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 131.
[242] Robinson 406
[243] II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 132.

is a consequence of greater social and net value than individual perfection leading to one's own immortality alone. "[The Torah] directed us with a commandment embracing all the affairs of man between man and his fellow, to wit, love, in saying, 'Thou shalt love they neighbour as thyself!' Indeed Hillel the Elder replied to the man who came to be proselytized on the condition that he teach him the entire Torah on one foot, saying to him: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself – 'what is hateful to you, do not do to your comrade; this is the whole Torah in its entirety; the rest is its commentary: go learn!'"[244]

The reader may have noticed that the acronym "ILG" and the qualifier 'intellectual' preceding 'love of God' in this sub-chapter have been missing, and so a brief word on the intellectual aspect of Crescas' concept of the love of God is in order. This is especially necessary since there are several passages in *Or Adonai* that place the love of God and its corresponding joy outside of the intellect and into the will.[245] The concept of the will, be it human or divine, is far too large an issue in Crescas to adequately present, let alone take on fully here. To put it simply, then, it is my understanding that, for Crescas, the concept of the will, especially the divine will, but certainly also the human will, is either identical to the intellect (as in the case of the divine will and intellect), or at least largely dependent thereon and determined thereby (as in the case of the human will and intellect).[246] There is certainly a tradition, known to Crescas, that held such a conflated understanding of the intellect and will, and several scholars, at least on the issue of divine will in

---

[244] Or Hashem II 6 1, translated by Harvey in Love: The Beginning and the End of Torah (1976).
[245] For but one instance: II.6.1, Third Proposition. Harvey (1998), p. 124.
[246] Feldman (1980), p. 313: "God is a kind of agent in Whom the will and the intellect coincide: He is, in Crescas' terminology, an "intellectual principle" (*hathalah sikhlith*). In such an agent the acts of willing and thinking are coextensive: whatever is willed is thought of and whatever is thought of is willed. There is ere no gap or second step between conception and volition."

In the case of human will, if "will is nothing other than the aggregate and the interrelation of the appetitive and imaginative faculties; and [the love and] the pleasure of the desire will be in proportion to that interrelation" (II.6.1. Harvey (1998), p. 125), then one could ask what coordinates or sets the proportion or the interrelation? To the extent that the intellect does these, and the intellect certainly regulates or otherwise affects the other faculties of the mind, we again have reason to be skeptical of a strong reading of Crescas' notion of will.

Crescas, agree that he too, perhaps esoterically,[247] conflated the two.[248] Logically speaking, God's unity simply demands His eternal will and eternal intellect be understood as identical, as essentially one. For our present purposes, even if the ascription of the esoteric conflated position to Crescas was ultimately wrong, and Crescas did maintain a strict distinction between the will and the intellect, the argument of the dissertation remains unaffected. First, one would be hard pressed to assert that for Crescas intellect, a proper understanding of God and existence, has nothing to do with our happiness and love of God. Our happiness and love of God may not directly depend on our intellect for Crescas, but they are also not wholly independent of it. Second, I am not claiming an identity between Crescas' and any other medieval Jewish thinker's conception of the love of God with that of Spinoza's. Therefore, on the one hand, if one is convinced of the distinction between the intellect and the will in Crescas, then let that be a difference between Crescas and Spinoza. Intellect still, if obscurely, plays a role in the love of God, and there are plenty of remaining parallels and similarities between their concepts of the love of God for a productive and enlightening comparison without the intellectual aspect as well. The above testifies to this. On the other hand, we

---

[247] Harvey "Towards Identifying the author of the reservations against determinism in Hasdai Crescas' Light of the Lord" (1980) pp. 794-801, discussing Crescas' theory of choice, ascribes a fear of persecution to Crescas as motivation for later edits of the manuscript of *Or Adonai* tampering down his strict determinism, if the edits are indeed Crescas'. The issues of choice and determinism are thoroughly tied up with that of the will. I therefore have company in ascribing esotericism to Crescas on this issue.

Recognizing the political and religious exigencies within which Crescas was writing and the very real threat he saw posed for his coreligionists' faith in the shaky foundations of the Aristotelian-Maimonidean philosophy that Judaism had come to so heavily depend on, one begins to develop good reasoning for such explicit anti-intellectualist and pro will statements, and in turn for an esoteric dimension to the text. Every instance in the *Or* that grounds human existence not in intellect but in the will is one more instance that asserts the independence of faith from philosophy, and thus the immunity of faith in the face of philosophical refutation. His coreligionists, not accomplished philosophers and thus with their faith vulnerable to philosophical refutation, so the argument goes, would no longer be so vulnerable, according to Crescas' understanding, as their faith would now depend on the will, not the refuted intellect. Those philosophically capable among the coreligionists, able to press Crescas' statements on the will and its relationship to the intellect, could find solace in their pursuit and love of wisdom.

[248] Feldman (1982), p. 26, p. 4 n.1: "Given certain assumptions about divine cognition and volition the distinction just drawn [between divine cognition and the divine will] may no longer obtain, and this may be the case in Crescas." This conflation of the two has its roots in the Jewish-Muslim philosophical tradition. Feldman (1982), p. 21: "Crescas' version of this concept [of God's eternal will] is again deeply influenced by Avicenna, where we find the notions of divine will and divine cognition virtually equated and characterized as eternal."

have other legitimate medieval Jewish philosophical sources for a comparative study of ILG, and adding this issue to the comparison to Crescas is but a lagnappe on top of an already sizable list of parallels between Crescas and Spinoza. This sizable list, adequately surveyed above, includes, *inter alia*, its being the telos, source and standard of value, supreme happiness, ethical and political ideal, and eternal reward of human existence. Over and above these parallels to Spinoza shared with Maimonides in his conception of the love of God, we need also mention Crescas' expansion of the love of God into a metaphysical and cosmic theory that includes God's love for existence and the love of the inanimate aspect of existence for God, as foreshadowing, if not influencing, Spinoza. Therefore, the abundance of parallels, and especially the importance and conceptual weight of the last two mentioned, make the claim of Crescas' influence on Spinoza on the concept of ILG hard to deny.[249] "Maimuni, Crescas and Spinoza present three links of a special chain in the development of philosophy… the intermediate link being presented by the system of Crescas, because it combines the premise of Maimuni with the conclusion of Spinoza."[250] As the above has shown, their respective conceptions of the love of God are certainly operating within the same conceptual universe, questions of a certain reading of the will, its relationship to the intellect, and the relationship of the love of God to the will and intellect, notwithstanding. We have thus presented Crescas as a significant stage on the way from Maimonides to Spinoza.

[249] This, over and above the connections discussed in II.B.i, is largely to the extent that substantial and abundant parallels can evidence influence. Of course, parallels can evidence a common intermediary source, or simply the idea that "great minds think alike." To my mind the connection is clear, but I leave that final decision for the reader.
[250] Neumark, p. 317-318.

II.C. The Concept of the Intellectual Love of God in Judah Abarbanel's *Dialoghi d'Amore* (Dialogues on Love).

II.C.i. The Connection.

The case for the connection between Judah Abarbanel[251] and Spinoza is the least certain of the three. Spinoza never refers to Abarbanel by name in any of his extant writings. Nor does he quote or refer to any of his works, obliquely or otherwise. There are, however, a few circumstantial historical facts that at least make the case for a connection between Judah Abarbanel and Spinoza possible, perhaps probable, if not likely. First, a Spanish translation of the *Dialoghi* (*Los Dialogos de Amor*) was found on Spinoza's bookshelf upon his death.[252] To derive from this fact maximum support for the case, one could observe that, if the logs are to be believed, the *Dialoghi* sat on the shelf nestled among several of Descartes' works.[253] Solely from Spinoza's having composed his *PPC*, let alone from the rest of Spinoza's corpus, wherein Descartes or Cartesians are one of the most frequently mentioned and present interlocutors of his, we can assert with certainty that he read

---

[251] Judah Abarbanel (~1460 – after 1521), son of the famed statesman, courtier, and exegete, Don Isaac Abarbanel, is known by many names, with even more English spellings of those names: Leone / Leo / Judah, Hebreo / Hebreau / Hebreaus / Ebreo / Abrabanel / Abravanel / Abarbanel. Though he shares the name Abarbanel with his father and many other individuals in history, herein I will refer to him simply as Abarbanel, specifying all other Abarbanels by first name.

For biography, see: Andrew L. Gluck, *Judah Abrabanel's Philosophy of Love and Kabbalah* (Lewiston: NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2012), pp. 53ff; Seymour Feldman, *Philosophy in a Time of Crisis: Don Isaac Abravanel: Defender of Faith* (NY: Routledge, 2003), pp. 161-188; Eric Lawee, *Isaac Abarbanel's Stance Toward Tradition: Defense, Dissent, and Dialogue* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2001), pp. 15ff, 313 s.v. Abarbanel, Judah; Benjamin Netanyahu *Don Isaac Abravanel: Statesman & Philosopher*, 5th Rev. ed. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); A.R. Milburn, "Leone Ebreo and the Renaissance" in *Isaac Abravanel: Six Lectures* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1937, pp. 133-157; Carl Gebhardt, *Leone Ebreo, Dialoghi d'Amore* (German) (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 1-110. For more context, see: the volumes by Feldman and Lawee just listed above, Bernard Dov Cooperman (ed.), *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), esp. articles by: Altmann, Davidson, Idel, Ivry, Pines. Also of note are several works by Aaron Hughes, including his *The Art of Dialogue in Jewish Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), Ch. 5, esp. pp. 117-120.

[252] Freudenthal (1899), p. 161. A.J. Servaas Van Rooijen, *Inventaire des livres formant la bibliotheque de Baruch Spinoza, publie d'apres un document inedit, avec des notes biographiques et bibliographiques et une introduction* (le Haye: W.C. Tengeler, 1888), p. 152, suggests it was the 1568 Venice edition, or either the 1584 or 1593 Saragossa editions. Gluck (2012) considers it to have been either the original 1568 or the 1598 re-print of the Gedalia Yahia Spanish translation (both published in Venice).

[253] Namely: a couple editions of Descartes' Meditations on First Philosophy (1641, 1642), a couple of his On Geometry (1641, 1649), and Descartes' 1650 Opera. Cf.Van Rooijen (1888), p. 149ff; Freudenthal (1899), p. 160ff.

Descartes, works on Descartes, and carefully, if critically, at that. This, in turn, so the argument goes, correspondingly increases the importance and influence of the proximately located *Dialoghi* for Spinoza. Second, there is the sheer popularity and wide ranging dissemination of Abarbanel's *Dialoghi d'Amore*. Though its original language of composition is a question of debate among scholars (possibilities include: Hebrew, Latin, Portuguese, Spanish, Ladino, and Italian),[254] it was, at least, first published in Italian in 1535. It was rapidly translated and retranslated into almost every European vernacular, as well as published again and again, in numerous editions, for much of the 16th c. and beyond.[255] Eloquently written and able to engage complex philosophical ideas using a more palatable diction for mass consumption, the *Dialoghi* was discussed by members of high and lay societies across Western Europe.[256] It enjoyed "unprecedented popularity among non-Jews."[257] It was, to put it differently, an international bestseller. Third, there is the peculiar if circumstantial fact that Rachel Abarbanel Soeiro, the wife of Menasseh Ben Israel (1604 – 1657),[258] one of Spinoza's educators and Jewish community leaders from his youth, was the great-granddaughter of Don Isaac Abarbanel and the great niece of Judah Abarbanel.[259] Jonas Abarbanel, also a descendent of the Abarbanel family, was a poet and publisher, and lived in Amsterdam coeval with Spinoza. Thus, insofar as not just the

---

[254] Guidi (2011), p. 318, leans towards an early Hebrew form or personal copy of the *Dialoghi*, but accepts a vulgar Italian popular translation as the first official published language. This transition, according to Guidi, shadows his family troubles. Gluck (2012), pp. 91-97, surveys those who believe its original language to be Hebrew, and other languages, but, finding the whole debate to be overly politically and ideologically inflected, ultimately sides with Italian as the original language of composition.

[255] For manuscript and edition history, see: Leone Ebreo, *Dialogues of Love*, trans. Cosmos Damian Bacich & Rossella Pescatori (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), pp. 413-418

[256] Giuseppe Veltri, "Leone Ebreo's Concept of Jewish Philosophy" in *Renaissance Philosophy in Jewish Garb* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), p. 63, ascribes the popularity and appeal of the *Dialoghi* to its numerous translations, its "entertaining, nonacademic disquisition on Platonic-Aristotelian doctrines clothed in mystical, astrological raiment," as well as its serving as a functional handbook of current Renaissance humanist ideas (p. 69f). Vila-Cha (2006), p. 266, mentions the encyclopedic value of the text, due to the *Dialoghi*'s frequent and often hierarchical surveys of: arguments, being, beings, Gods, angels, loves, beauties, of human faculties, emotions, virtues, etc.

[257] Hughes (2008), p. 137.

[258] Yosef Kaplan, Henry Mechoulan & Richard H. Popkin (eds.), *Menasseh Ben Israel and his World* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989). Judah J. Slotki, *Menasseh ben Israel, His Life and Times* (London: Jewish Religious Educational Publications, 1953). Menasseh is most famous for having petitioned Oliver Cromwell for the readmission of the Jews into England.

[259] Villa-Cha, p. 1007.

ideas of Abarbanel's *Dialoghi* but the book itself had route to and purchase with Spinoza's childhood community, and thus possibly with Spinoza himself early in his development, insofar as the *Dialoghi* were found in his possession, even and especially at the end of his life, and in a place of relative importance, we have reason enough to include the *Dialoghi* in the contextual background of an analysis of Spinoza's thought, generally speaking. With regards to the concept of ILG, specifically, a concept of both thinkers having numerous and substantial parallels (to be discussed below), it is just responsible intellectual history.

The history of our scholarly understanding of the connection between Abarbanel and Spinoza is a curious one. Direct influence was hypothesized in the mid-19th c., and "established," chiefly by Solmi,[260] and especially with regards to their concepts of ILG, early in the 20th c.[261] Carl Gebhardt, the editor of what became the critical edition of the Latin text of Spinoza's corpus even to this day,[262] was inspired by his work on Spinoza to in turn read all the volumes found on Spinoza's bookshelf upon his death.[263] Upon re-discovering, to a certain extent, Abarbanel's *Dialoghi*, Gebhardt became convinced not only of the importance of Abarbanel for Spinoza – over and above the likes of Descartes, Scholasticism, Hobbes, or Stoicism (!) – but for the history of philosophy *in toto*. As a result, a few years after his critical edition of Spinoza's *Opera*, Gebhardt published a critical edition of the *Dialoghi*, containing a facsimile of the *editio princeps* of 1535, with an index, some Hebrew poetry of Abarbanel's, numerous other biographical and contextualizing documents, most translated into German, and a lengthy introduction to Abarbanel's life and works.[264] In this study,

---

[260] Edmondo Solmi, *Benedetto Spinoza e Leone Ebreo. Studio su una fonte italiana dimenticata dello Spinozismo* (Modena: G.T. Vincenzi e Nipoti, 1903): "Spinoza's theory of the intellectual love of God is analogous to that of Ebreo's," p. 60; "Not a correction of Descartes' theory, it is a superimposed crowning concept drawn from traditional Jewish principles, and above all from Leone Ebreo," p. 54 (translations mine).
[261] Vila-Cha, pp. 1001ff.
[262] Spinoza, *Opera*, ed. Carl Gebhardt, 4 Vols. (Berlin: 1925).
[263] This is said to have resulted in his owning a considerable library of Spinozana, second only to that of Rudolph Oko, the famed bibliographer of Spinoza.
[264] Carl Gebhardt, *Leone Ebreo, Dialoghi d'Amore* (Heidelberg: 1929).

and one earlier one,[265] Gebhardt found the presence of the *Dialoghi* most especially in Spinoza's *KV*, a work in which there is a more immediately noticeable Neoplatonic tenor, a tenor filtered through the *Dialoghi*'s own strongly Neoplatonic resonance. Moreover, finds Gebhardt, the influence of the *Dialoghi* abided, if to a lesser degree, from the young Spinoza's *KV* through to Spinoza's *Ethics*. This is evidenced in particular in Spinoza's definition of love and his concept of ILG, which includes both creation's love for God and God's love for creation.[266]

Wolfson, effectively the overly generous admissions officer for Spinoza's medieval Jewish sources, and cautiously raising again our methodological concerns discussed earlier, nonetheless, and surprisingly, disagreed. Despite drawing myriad lines of influence between Spinoza and much of medieval Jewish (, Islamic, and Christian) thought, Wolfson found such claims to be "unduly exaggerated."[267] Perhaps ideologically motivated with a bias against the seeming lack of Aristotelian rigour in Abarbanel's *Dialoghi*, Wolfson found other sources for many of the ideas in Spinoza deemed by others to be built on or derived from Abarbanel to be more likely.

Since World War II, the whole academic discussion about the connection between Abarbanel and Spinoza has progressed little. There is, of course, the occasional article analyzing some commonality between Abarbanel and Spinoza.[268] Moreover, certain passages of the *Dialoghi* simply resonate in retrospect.[269] However, on the one hand, Abarbanel scholars unfortunately suffer from a similar affliction as many Spinoza scholars – that discussed above in Chapter I – where, when discussing the connection between Abarbanel and Spinoza, and especially with regards to Spinoza's own concept of ILG, they cite the later propositions of EV, if anything beyond a

---

[265] Carl Gebhardt, "Spinoza und der Platonismus" in *Chronicon Spinozanum*, Vol. 1, 1921, pp. 178-234
[266] Gebhardt (1921), esp. pp. 182-188, 216-224.
[267] Wolfson (1934), II, p. 277 n. 5.
[268] For example: Abraham Mounitz, "The One and the Many in the Works of Spinoza and Judah Abarbanel" (Hebrew) in *Da'at* 55 (2005), p. 59-72.
[269] For several examples, see especially the notes in 2.C.II.

secondary authority, rarely with much analysis, and merely declare the obvious parallels with their preceding discussion of Abarbanel's philosophy of love, justifying their claims as to the historical importance of the *Dialoghi* (and their interpretations of it).[270] On the other hand, Spinoza scholars are happy to cite scholars of Abarbanel, often Gebhardt, or Wolfson if they disagree with the assertion of influence, and rarely follow up with serious analysis. I do not know which side first relied on the other, but we seem to have a mutually reinforced dependence that has benefited no one. I dare not venture an explanation for this phenomenon, but I suspect it has something to do with the diametrically different methods of composition of their respective chief works (poetic dialogue vs. geometric proof), combined with the institutional and disciplinary disparities that exist between scholars of either thinker, time period, or cultural context. Either way, a case for the connection between Abarbanel and Spinoza, generally speaking, has been presented. Hopefully, in what follows, the connection specifically with regards to ILG, the central and most substantial parallel between them, will become even clearer.

II.C.ii. Judah Abarbanel's Concept of the Intellectual Love of God.

It should come as no surprise by now that the concept of the Intellectual Love of God (ILG), just as for medieval Jewish thought generally speaking, and just as for Spinoza after him,[271] is

[270] Angela Guidi, *Amour et Sagesse: Les Dialogues d'Amour de Juda Abravanel Dans La Tradition Salomonienne* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), p. 2, cites Wolfson (1934, Vol. II, p. 277) and moves on from the question. Suzanne Damiens, *Amour et Intellect chez Leon L'Hebreu* (Toulouse: Edouard Private, 1971), pp. 177f: "Without wishing to further prolong this [brief section's] study of the possible relations between Spinoza and Leone Ebreo, we may conclude by stating that the Jew of Amsterdam is situated, to a sufficient extent, in the intellectual heritage of his ancestor of the synagogue: Leone Ebreo" (translation mine). Vila-Cha, despite spending due time and space on the parallels between the *Dialoghi* and the *KV*, pp. 1014ff, quotes EVp32-5, p. 1029, in one fell swoop and moves on.

[271] Vila-Cha, p. 1028: "In other words, like Leone Ebreo, Spinoza transforms the notion of amor Dei into the foundational stone of his philosophy."

a central if not the cardinal concept in Abarbanel's *Dialoghi*.[272] Religious heritage aside, love was a popular topic of the Renaissance, with numerous works, treatises, and poems of the era dedicated to it, and Abarbanel was certainly a (Jewish) Renaissance thinker. Moreover, the work, after all, is called the *Dialoghi d'Amore*, the Dialogues on *Love*, and all three extant parts of the *Dialoghi* have love, or some aspect of it, as their topic. The first part discusses love and desire. The second part discusses the universality of love. The third part discusses the origin of love. The hypothetical but suspected fourth part would seem to have discussed the effects of love.[273] Ultimately and unavoidably an understatement of the fact: love is an expansive all-encompassing concept for Abarbanel. Scholars attempting to define Abarbanel's concept of ILG, let alone love *simpliciter*, tend to produce rather loquacious texts for the extreme amount of work the concept does in his philosophy. All of its multi-faceted instances and permutations at every level of Abarbanel's hierarchical conception of existence simply demand so many pages of attention. In what follows below I try to avoid this consequence by focusing more on ILG over love *tout court*. However, a brief overview of the concept of love in the *Dialoghi* precedes.

Before turning to Abarbanel's concept of love, however, we need a comparative word on the different styles of writing exhibited by the *Dialoghi* and Spinoza's *Ethics*.[274] The art of rhetoric in Italy at the time of Abarbanel's composing the *Dialoghi* had replaced medieval Aristotelian notions of demonstration.[275] With the re-discovery of Quintilian (1416) and Cicero's *De Oratore* (1421), and other key Greek and Roman works fueling the Renaissance, oratory and communication, rhetoric,

---

[272] In this case, cardinal may actually be more accurate. This is especially so if pantheism or an identity between love and intellectual love of God holds. To my understanding, both do.
[273] Towards the end of *Dialoghi* III, Philo promises Sophia to discuss "the effects of human love" next they meet (*Dialoghi*, p. 468). For more on Part IV, see: David Harari, "The Traces of the Missing Fourth Dialogue on Love by Judah Abravanel Known as Leone Ebreo" (Hebrew) in *Italia* 7.1–2 (1988), pp. 93–155.
[274] What follows draws from and is largely inspired by Alexander Altmann's *Ars Rhetorica* , with other parallel secondary sources mentioned in the notes.
[275] Vila-Cha, pp. 520ff.

was the vehicle of universalism, not demonstrative proofs.[276] Thus, Abarbanel, via his dialogue between Philo and Sophia, just as much as Spinoza, via the definitions, axioms, and propositions of his geometric method, intended to convince and persuade the reader using the ideal means as understood by the educated and informed by the science and psychology of the day. Writing as they did, one can argue, was an equally *au courant* decision for them both. In both cases, Abarbanel and Spinoza strove for objectivity and universality, the former through beautiful poetic dialogue, the latter through rigorous axioms and demonstrations.

Love, for Abarbanel, is a cosmic principle.[277] While Abarbanel "adopts the notion of love as a cosmic principle from the likes of Ficino and Pico [and Crescas][278]; on the other hand, he develops it in such a way that love permeates and gives life to the entire cosmos."[279] Love is the "mainspring of the earth's commotion, that which induces and ordains the harmony of the universe."[280] It is the motivating force behind creation,[281] as well as the maintaining and sustaining force of all of existence.[282] Love also drives all of existence to return to and unify with its source.[283] Moreover, this

---

[276] Hughes (2004), p. 468f, uses the term "poetic theology" when discussing the fact that allegory and figurative speech were no longer barriers to philosophical knowledge, but the main means to recognizing and describing and persuading others of truth and divinity in the world.

[277] Guidi (2011), p. 106: "une vision de l'action cosmique et ontologique de l'amour, qui descend du parfait au moins parfait, de Dieu jusqu'au chaos, et remonte aussi le meme chemin en sense inverse." On the other hand, see: Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah & Eros* (2005), pp. 93/4: "Love as a religiously significant phenomenon is conceived as an attitude of the human soul or of the intellect toward God, because both are part of a primordial spiritual union, separated by the descent of the soul into the material world, but regained by the ascent of the soul to the source."

[278] Brian P. Copenhaver, "Foreward" in Leone Ebreo, *Dialogues of Love*, trans. Cosmos Damian Bacich & Rossella Pescatori (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), p. xii: "[In Abarbanel's *Dialoghi*,] Ficino's Platonism, and perhaps some of Pico's idiosyncratic enthusiasms, are as evident as the ideas of Crescas on cosmic love."

[279] Aaron Hughes, "Epigone, Innovator, or Apologist? Judah Abravanel and his Dialoghi d'Amore" in *Studia Rosenthaliana* , Vol. 40 (2007-2008), p. 121.

[280] A.R. Milburn, "Leone Ebreo and the Renaissance" in *Isaac Abravanel: Six Lectures* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1937), p. 142.

[281] DdA, p. 440: "You know at any rate that the world was produced by the supreme Creator through the medium of love… His love was born towards this universe."

[282] DdA, p. 442: "The first divine love, that is the love of the most high God for His own supreme beauty and wisdom, was the cause of the creation of the universe in the likeness of that beauty, and also of its continual preservation (for the love which first produced it ever preserves from dissolution by continual creation)." Cf. Eugenio Garin, *History of Italian Philosophy* , trans. & ed. Giogrio A. Pinton (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), p. 394: "But not only is God the object of love, It is the suscitation of love."

redemptive unity is achieved in and through love. Love causes the effect of love which returns; love precedes and follows love.[284] Combining the horizontal and vertical axes of love, Abarbanel develops a "universal philography,"[285] something, according to Vila-Cha, akin to the concept of nature in Spinoza.[286] Even inanimate beings have love, insofar as their particular natures depend on "Nature, which knows and governs all lower things: - i.e. by the soul of the World… so they are by Nature directed to love and desire [to knowledge of their end and proper station]."[287] "Without love not only can there be no felicity; but the world would not exist nor would anything be found therein, if there were no love… Love itself is the condition of the existence of the world and all in it… God most high creates and governs the world by love, and binds it together in unity… For love is a vivifying spirit penetrating all the world and a bond uniting the whole Universe."[288]

The *Dialoghi*'s discussion of the circle of love illustrates the utter saturation of his cosmos, and philosophy, with love.[289] Introduced originally in the context of a discussion on "Arabic teaching" in *Dialoghi* II,[290] the circle of love is discussed more fully towards the end of *Dialoghi* III in response to a request from Sophia to have the "hierarchy of loves in the universe" explained to her.[291] In response, Philo describes two half circles of love that together make up the circle of love. The first half circle is "the descent from Him to the lowest and most distant point from His supreme perfection...first matter, the least perfect of eternal substances and the farthest removed

---

283 DdA, p. 442: "The second divine love which is for the created universe is that which brings the creation to its ultimate perfection."
284 Vila-Cha, p. 591.
285 Vila-Cha, p. 266.
286 Vila-Cha, p. 763.
287 DdA, p. 76.
288 DdA, p. 190f.
289 Moshe Idel, "The Sources of the Circle Images in "*Dialoghi d'Amore*" (Hebrew) in *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly, Vol.* 28 (1978), p. 156-166. Seymour Feldman, *Philosophy in a Time of Crisis: Don Isaac Abravanel: Defender of Faith* (NY: Routledge, 2003), pp. 171-75. Hughes (2008), pp. 130-2.
290 DdA, p. 335.
291 DdA, p. 449-453.

from the high perfection of the Creator."[292] It is "love of the more beautiful for the less and of the perfect for the imperfect."[293] The second half circle returns from first matter, "ascending from lesser to greater," up through the elements, plants, our souls, intellect, "until it reaches the supreme act of intellection, which has its object the Divinity; and this is final union…with the most high Divinity itself."[294] It is "love of the less for the more."[295] This highly Neoplatonic schema is thus imbued with love at any and all levels.[296] Vila-Cha, in analyzing the circle of love, distinguishes six stages which all together traverse every aspect of existence: God's love of self, God's creative love, God's sustaining love, God's redeeming love, Universe's purifying love, and the Universe's unifying love.[297] "The whole circle of the love of the universe correspond[s] to that of the various degrees of being…the end of these loves is the final act of union of the universe with its Creator."[298] No wonder, then, all the scholarly ink. The inevitable understatement above proves to be woefully inadequate but will have to suffice for our present purposes.

While he certainly does not neglect the intellectual aspect of love, Abarbanel was "one of the first Renaissance writers not to denigrate sensual, physical love. Indeed, in his hands, such love becomes the prolegomenon to higher forms of love and knowledge of God."[299] Abarbanel "celebrates sensual love as the gateway to cosmic or spiritual love. Such love, for him, becomes that which directs the individual towards the Divine."[300] "Abravanel [thereby] re-signifies human love as

---

[292] DdA, p. 450.
[293] DdA, p. 452.
[294] Dda, p. 450.
[295] DdA, p. 452.
[296] DdA, pp. 451-3
[297] Vila-Cha, pp. 745ff
[298] DdA, p. 453.
[299] Hughes (2007-2008), p. 113. Cf. Guidi (2011), p. 103.
[300] Hughes (2007-2008), p. 118. Guidi (2011), p. 111, argues that the focus on and inclusion of the body in spiritual/intellectual perfection/ascension may be a particularly Jewish motif, insofar as the Jewish tradition, from the Song of Songs to rationalist dependencies on proportional bodies, was never too ascetic. DdA, pp. 56-7, 212, 262-4,318.

the love which individuals have for God,"[301] something which strongly parallels the idea in Spinoza that our intellectual love of other finite modes, insofar as they are affections of Substance/God, just is our love of God.[302] As a result, rather than prudishly or piously shy away from it, Abarbanel, as with Spinoza later, thoroughly incorporates the physical – corporeal, material existence – into his system, and not just as something to be overcome or transcended, but engaged and embraced, known and loved.[303] Indeed, corporeality is an essential attribute of existence and an object of love, an attribute and object that has had scholars (often ideologically) scramble to justify Abarbanel's "pantheistic tendencies" and to distance them from his "true" position, which, for one reason or another, couldn't possibly be pantheist.[304] However, a more level headed analysis of these "tendencies," perhaps one grounded in their own logical principles, and not ours, to my mind, leads

---

[301] Hughes (2007-2008), p. 118. Cf. Hughes (2008), p. 130.

[302] EVp36, *Works*, p. 378-9.

[303] Abarbanel shares much on the issue of the nature of the material principle of existence with Gersonides. Though it can only be said to exist in the loosest of senses, Chaos, an infinite, raw potential stuff – matter – is eternal and coeval with God, yet caused by God for Abarbanel (DdA, p. 83ff). "[The] old established saying 'nothing can be made out of nothing' … although he assumes the world to be made anew, he does not assume it to be made from nothing, but of the material of ancient and eternal chaos, the mother of all things created and informed" … "chaos, the material of the world, was made from eternity by the Supreme Creator" (DdA, p. 283).

[304] Guttman, p. 298. Damiens (1971), recognizing that human ILG just is divine ILG for Abarbanel (p. 175), nevertheless denies an Averroes style pantheism to Abarbanel, likening Abarbanel's pantheism to, if anything, that of the stoics, and not even Spinoza's (p. 179). Alfred Ivry, "Remnants of Jewish Averroism" in Bernard Dov Cooperman (ed.), *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 247: "With regard to divine immanence, Ebreo goes further [but not all the way] towards uniting man directly with God than do most medievals;" Hubert Dethier, "Love and Intellect in Leone Ebreo: The Joys and Pains of Human Passion" in *Neoplatonism and Jewish Thought*, ed. Lenn Goodman (SUNY Press, 1992), pp. 353-386, opens with a brief discussion of Abarbanel's unique brand of pantheism. Dethier finds Abarbanel's pantheism to be a result of his identifying God with the Active/Actual Intellect, and the Intellect – a Plotinian unity of ideas composing the thoughts of God – being already identified with the totality of things. Nevertheless, this somehow does not entail a complete and utterly uniform divinity throughout existence (p. 355), causing Dethier to prefer the term "panlogism" (p. 354). Vila-Cha, p. 661, thinks it at best an "intellectual sort" of pantheism, due to the effect not being identical to the cause. Gluck (2012), also discusses the pantheistic ramifications of the identity of the Active Intellect with God (p. 231), arguing that pantheism is an anachronism and that, at most, Abarbanel's *Dialoghi* exhibit "pantheistic tendencies" (pp. 305ff, 330ff, 610) or a "cosmic quasi-pantheism" (p. 132). What, however, is so "quasi" is unclear, and the anachronism of the term doesn't preclude it from accurately describing a situation.

The best argument against pantheism in the *Dialoghi*, to my mind, is the importance of creation *ex nihilo* for Judah's father, Don Isaac. Judah was an independent thinker, however, so even this doesn't hold very well. For the identification of God with the Active intellect: DdA p. 45. Adding but the following two passages alone also gets one perilously close to pantheism: "Therefore you would not have the divine mind and intellect to be other than the pattern of the universe according to which it was created? – Truly no other" (p. 411); and "In the divinity, therefore, the knower is one with its knowledge, the wise with its wisdom, and he who understands and the intellect with the object of intellection" (p. 413/4).

one to the inescapable conclusion of pantheism, and a strikingly similar understanding of it to what we will find in Spinoza, too.[305] Moreover, denying Abarbanel's pantheism can have serious consequences. For example, Abarbanel's insistence that God's love for creation, specifically, or love of the higher for the lower, generally, does not entail any lack on the part of God / the higher is defended by Abarbanel in large part via reference to the ultimate organic unity and universality of love, on the identity of the love of the lower with the love of the highest for itself.[306] Were this unity of existence not to include God and His love (both of self and of creation, which on some readings are identical), were it not grounded in pantheism, it would not support Abarbanel's denial of lack in God. But I digress.

We turn now to Abarbanel's concept of ILG specifically. He begins *Dialoghi* I by distinguishing love as something greater than desire. For, as Abarbanel notes, desire indicates a lack, whereas love is in fact the enjoyment of attaining to or satisfying one's desire. "Love pertains to things which exist; desire to those which do not."[307] "[To] define desire as an affect of the will aimed at the coming to be or coming to be ours of a thing we judge good and have not; and to define love, as an affect of the will to enjoy through union the thing judged good."[308] However, "love of God is ever united with ardent desire: namely, to gain whatever we lack in knowledge of God; so that the increase of our love keeps pace with that of our knowledge."[309] Knowledge, therefore, and logically enough, precedes love insofar as it informs how and what to properly love, "because love must be preceded by knowledge; for we could not love any thing we had not first known as good. And we

---

[305] Vila-Cha, p. 662: "In this manner, we can see, in the pages of the DDA, a thinker like Spinoza already in the making, while at the same time recognize that we are still a step away from the Spinozistic formula of *Deus sive natura* that we find in the *Ethica*."
[306] Dda, p. 179ff. Spinoza EVp36, *Works*, p. 378/9.
[307] DdA p. 6.
[308] DdA, p. 12. Cf. "Enjoyment of a thing and union therewith" (KV II, 5, *Works*, p. 68) & "Pleasure accompanied by the idea of an external cause" (EIII Def. 6, *Works*, p. 312).
[309] DdA, p. 35.

cannot have knowledge of anything before it is actually in being."[310] We find out later, however, that this "distinction between [love and knowledge] is but the work of reason and not real or essential."[311] Love and knowledge are, in fact, "found together… love is intellectual and … intellection of the highest things steeped in love."[312] Thus, the intellectual in ILG.

Turning to the affective aspect of ILG, we see that Abarbanel is clear, stating that "intellectual pleasure, however, is not an affection in the intellect which loves…they are intellectual activities."[313] Thus, much as with Maimonides, Crescas, and Spinoza, ILG (or love of God in the case of Crescas) is an action, not a passion; it is an active loving, not a passive emotion. This position on love as an action, not a passion, allows Abarbanel to claim, as Crescas does, that God also experiences the joy attendant on intellectual love, for "…the highest pleasure must needs reside in Him, proceed from Him and be directed towards him… God, moreover, is one and the same as the pleasure which is His and the object which inspires it."[314] This whole issue, the affective dimensions of both human and divine ILG, as we will see, has its parallel in Spinoza.

In looking to delineate the specific function of ILG in the philosophical system of the *Dialoghi*, and in order to more fully define Abarbanel's concept of ILG, we turn now to those functions established in our discussion of Maimonides's concept of ILG and returned to in Crescas.

Regarding the end of human existence, its *telos*, were the fourth dialogue to be extant, insofar as it assumedly dealt with the effects of love, we would, I am sure, have plenty more to analyze and quote. As it stands, however, we are not wanting for clarity on the issue. Abarbanel states that "by means of this love and desire for God [existence, including human existence] attains to that ultimate

[310] DdA, p. 6.
[311] DdA, p. 446. Vila-Cha, p. 906.
[312] DdA, p. 446.
[313] DdA, p. 456.
[314] DdA, p. 457.

and perfect union which is the final and most perfect activity,"[315] and that "the true end of this love is unitive enjoyment of Him, which is its ultimate perfection… so that the end of the last and highest love of the created universe is the ultimate and common end of every individual."[316]

Being humanity's ultimate perfection and telos, its highest good, ILG, in turn, and once again, becomes the standard by which we judge the value of everything else. This is insofar as all else, all being, all knowledge, and all action, is valued only insofar as it contributes to this highest good and end. "Since love is excellent in proportion as its object is known to be good, and, therefore, love of God must surpass all other good loves or noble deeds,"[317] then "love of God not only partakes of good, but comprises the goodness of all things and all loves; for the Godhead is at once origin, means and end, of all good deeds."[318] Thus, insofar as "Ebreo defines love not in terms of beauty, as Ficino did, but in terms of the good,"[319] and love is a cosmic principle, then love, existence, and the good, become almost identical, something with which Spinoza would be hard pressed to disagree with.

While on the topic of value, of note is the fact that Abarbanel, much like both Maimonides before him and Spinoza after him,[320] ultimately relativizes good and evil. "…The Universe needs both for its preservation. And in the light of that need every evil is a good, for whatsoever is necessary to the being of the Universe is assuredly good, since the being of the Universe is good… Be not surprised, therefore, if both alike have for divine principle an immaterial Idea."[321]

Union, a result of ILG, plays a major redemptive role in the *Dialoghi*. "Our intellect returns

---

[315] DdA 447
[316] DdA 449
[317] Dda 34
[318] Dda, 31
[319] John Charles Nelson *Renaissance Theory of Love*, p. 85, cited in Gluck (2012), p. 599.
[320] *Guide,* I.2, discussed above (2.A.I); EIVApp., *Works*, pp. 358-62, to be discussed below, in Chapter III.
[321] DdA, p. 119.

to its supreme Creator by three means, intellection, love, and the enjoyment of union."[322] On further analyses, however, these three means are identical, or at least mutually interdependent and consequent of each other: "Through intellect alone the whole of the universe is made worthy of union… and of achieving perfection and lasting happiness in enjoyment of this union with the Divinity;"[323] "They [our souls/intellects] enjoy divine love, and after separation from the body achieve the union with God, which is their supreme happiness."[324] Unity also has a socio-political dimension insofar as "the purpose of the whole is the perfection in unity… but the purpose of each part is, not merely the perfection of that part in itself, but also the right promotion by that perfection of the perfection of the whole, which is the universal end and the first purpose of the Godhead."[325] Finally there is the affective dimension of union, "for pleasure is naught else than union with the pleasurable… Therefore to say that the end of love is the pleasure of the lover in the beloved is equivalent to saying that it is the union of the lover with the beloved."[326]

Returning briefly to the question of pantheism but from the perspective of the issue of union, we see that Abarbanel's philosophy seems to hold that there is no level of existence, no domain of the Godhead or Divine essence beyond that attained to in the highest union, for "this is final union, not only with the angelic nature, but through its medium with the most high Divinity itself."[327] Thus, arguably, this passage at least, and others,[328] is highly indicative of pantheism, and precluding of panentheism.

Immortality, for Abarbanel, as for Maimonides, Crescas, and Spinoza, is also a necessary

[322] DdA, p. 446.
[323] DdA, p. 447.
[324] DdA, p. 190.
[325] DdA, p. 188.
[326] DdA, p. 435.
[327] DdA, p. 450.
[328] Cf., the discussion of pantheism in Abarbanel above, pp. 108-110, esp. fn. 304.

effect of ILG: "…in respect of that by which they are immortal, viz. their intellect,"[329] or "through intellect alone the whole of the universe is made worthy of union… and of achieving perfection and *lasting* happiness in enjoyment of this union with the Divinity."[330] Once again, "They [our souls / intellects] enjoy divine love, and after separation from the body achieve the union with God, which is their supreme happiness."[331] Also of note is that immortality, as for Maimonides (on one reading) and for Spinoza, is impersonal, for "such union overrides the distinction of persons and bodily individuality, engendering in such friends a peculiar mental essence, preserved by their joint wisdoms, loves and wills, exactly as if this love governed but a single soul and being, embracing, two persons."[332]

Abarbanel unsurprisingly also ties ILG to politics. "The purpose of the whole is the perfection in unity… but the purpose of each part is, not merely the perfection of that part in itself, but also the right promotion by that perfection of the perfection of the whole, which is the universal end and the first purpose of the Godhead."[333] Or, as he states later in the *Dialoghi*, "virtuous love is that of the moral and intellectual virtues. And since morals concern the activities of man [i.e. politics], their matter must be in conformity with the nature of these activities in which virtue exists [namely: intellectual love]."[334]

Abarbanel spends far more ink discussing God's ILG than does anyone else mentioned in this dissertation. "He is the first being; and all that exists, exists through participation in Him. He is pure activity; He is Supreme Intellect, from which all intellect, activity, form and perfection derive. To him all things tend, as to their most perfect end; in Him they subsist without multiplication or

[329] DdA, p. 120.
[330] DdA, p. 447 (italics mine).
[331] DdA, p. 190.
[332] DdA, p. 31
[333] DdA, p. 188.
[334] DdA, p. 438.

division, in utter simplicity and unity. He is true happiness. His is necessary to all, but none is necessary to Him. In contemplating himself, He knows all things; He contemplates, and is contemplated by, Himself."[335] "You know at any rate that the world was produced by the supreme Creator through the medium of love… His love was born towards this universe"[336] "So the end of this love is…that the latter may acquire that perfection which it would lack were it not imparted to it through the love of the love, and that the divine Lover may take pleasure in the increased beauty of His beloved, the universe, which increase is the result of divine love."[337]

In conclusion, though one may claim that what Spinoza drew from Abarbanel could certainly have been sourced from Maimonides, Crescas, or even others, Abarbanel does have a unique contribution to this vein of intellectual history, namely: pantheism, and especially as he develops it in and through the cosmic, universal scope of love, which not just includes but stresses the physical aspect of existence – something lacking in Crescas, and which Spinoza certainly picked up on, and gave geometric expression to. Abarbanel has thus been presented as another crucial stage in this vein of intellectual history from Maimonides to Spinoza.

* * *

The beginning of this Chapter set out four objectives that we are now well on our way to achieving. A particular vein of intellectual history has been presented – the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition. The connections between Spinoza and the selected representatives of this particular vein have been presented and argued for. The importance of this tradition for an adequate

[335] DdA, p. 46. Though the quotation does not mention love explicitly, we shortly thereafter, and certainly by the end of the *Dialoghi,* learn that most of what is being described in the quote refers to love. "Activity," "participation," "tend," "happiness," all correlate to love, intellectual love.
[336] DdA, p. 440.
[337] DdA, p. 441.

understanding of Spinoza has been *a fortiori* made clear. Moreover, as we continue on to Spinoza, his place in this tradition, and again its importance, will only continue to become clearer. The role and function of ILG within this tradition has been presented and schematized, identifying six key features, among numerous other smaller aspects. These include that ILG is: the telos of human existence, the source and standard of all value, the ethical and political ideal, necessary for and consists of union or some kind of identity with God, grounded in knowledge of God and existence, and the cause of immortality. It is an all-consuming happiest state of being that is directed towards God and existence in and through knowledge of God and existence. It is also often referred to with religiously inflected terms such as "blessedness," and "glory." That ILG has exactly these features in Spinoza as well should now no longer be so much of a surprise, or even confusing. It must be engaged full on, and now, from this historically informed perspective, can be. Therefore, in light of the consistent appearance of ILG, with these features, in this vein and tradition, their appearance in Spinoza will be used to undergird the reading of Spinoza's concept of ILG presented in Chapter III of the dissertation and the application of this reading to certain central issues of ethics, politics, and religion in Spinoza's system in Chapter IV's conclusion. In arguing for what is ultimately the obviousness of ILG in Spinoza's system I have also attempted to trace a particular narrative through this vein and tradition. This narrative, using Maimonides as baseline, as he was for so much of Jewish thought, then added Crescas' concept of God's love, and then Abarbanel's pantheistic cosmic love, to arrive at what we find in Spinoza. Thus, we can indeed safely say that "Spinoza seems to be one of the last exponents of highly elaborated theories of love, and he apparently follows, at least in some cases, views formulated by medieval and Renaissance Jewish authors."[338] Mindful of the dangers of claims of influence, however, to further justify the preceding Chapter, I have also sought

[338] Idel (2005), p. 200.

to establish a universe of discourse within which to situate, contextualize, compare, and understand Spinoza's concept of ILG, and in turn the system within which we find it. The discussions of Spinoza's concept of ILG to be taken up below now have a robust background against which we are to understand it and from which we may draw on in making sense of the concept in Spinoza's system, the veracity of any particular provided narrative of influence notwithstanding. The fruitfulness of the analysis will bear proof to its legitimacy.

III. The Intellectual Love of God in Spinoza

The term 'love' (*amor*) and its cognates appear in the English text of *Spinoza: Complete Works*,[1] a 959 page volume, 322 times,[2] or about once every 3 pages of proper Spinozistic text. For a rationalist philosopher of Spinoza's acumen and renown this may *prima facie* seem to be a rather high number.[3] However, when we take into consideration that for Spinoza, like other rationalist philosophers of his day, and beyond, the regulation of the emotions, or affects (*affectus),* was essential to rational and thus human perfection, if not identical to it, this then changes the number from a curiosity of the modern digital search function to one of at least potential philosophical import. The intellectual love of God (ILG), the central concept of this dissertation, and, as I shall argue, of Spinoza's thought as a whole, is a sub-species of love more generally. It is the highest form of love and love in the truest sense of the word.[4] As a concept, ILG appears in every work penned by Spinoza,[5] including some of his letters,[6] and, perhaps more importantly, as the final[7] concept argued

[1] The second and final volume of Curley's translation of the complete works of Spinoza was at long last released towards the end of the writing of this dissertation. Striving for consistency, certainly a single, complete presentation of Spinoza's works as a whole has its advantages, both for the current accounting purposes and for the dissertation at large. Thus, in light of my previous use of Shirley's translation of Spinoza's corpus, a solid scholarly translation in its own right, found in a single volume, my use of Shirley is ongoing. With regards to the Latin original, the lack of a case system in English, vis-à-vis Latin, makes for identifying instances of a concept, variously inflected, a much simpler endeavor.

[2] My aim here is not exhaustiveness, but merely illustrative, and the addition of further instances would only serve to better the point being made, that 'love' is ubiquitous in Spinoza's thought, as well as the thesis of the dissertation, whereas subtracting instances, to any considerable extent, would be rather hard to argue. What follows is an accounting of the term 'love' as it appears in the English text of Spinoza's complete works as translated by Samuel Shirley (2002): Four (4) times in the TIE, one-hundred twenty-four (124) times in the *KV*, twice (2) in the PPC with eight (8) in the CM, seventy-six (76) and fourteen (14) times in the TTP and TP, respectively, eight (8) times in the incomplete *Hebrew Grammar*, and in eighty-six (86) propositions of the *Ethics*.

[3] The number is actually even higher. In accounting for the *Ethics*, if the term appeared more than once over the course of a single proposition, in its demonstrations, scholia, or corollaries, it was counted as one occurrence. Accounting for every instance in the *Ethics* brings the number from eighty-six to over one-hundred seventy times. This also corrects the apparent discrepancy between the high number of occurrences in the shorter *KV* and the number given for the *Ethics*. If we use the larger number for the *Ethics* the average is closer to once every two pages. For all other texts, each instance of the term is counted as such.

[4] Insert reference for ILG = token of love. More on this relation will be said below.

[5] Roth (1929), p. 141: "In one form or another [ILG] is to be found in all his works."

[6] Eps. 21, 43, 73, & 78

for (along with its concomitant the eternity of the mind)[8] in his philosophical magnum opus, the *Ethics*. Designated by various terms such as "Highest Good,"[9] "Supreme Good" or "Supreme Happiness,"[10] "Blessedness,"[11] as well as by numerous variations of ILG itself – "love of God," "intellectual knowledge of God," "knowledge of God," and even "intellectual cognition of God"[12] – the concept of ILG appears at least 90 times in the English *Complete Works*,[13] or once every 10 pages or so.[14] If Spinoza was a "God intoxicated man,"[15] or "*theissimus*"[16] [most theistic], it was because he intellectually loved God with all his "heart, soul, and strength"[17] and pen.[18]

What follows below then is a discussion of the concept of ILG as it appears in each of Spinoza's works. Beginning briefly with his earlier works and leading up to a more thorough discussion of the more robust (and geometric) presentation of the concept of ILG in the *Ethics*, then returning to his Letters and unfinished works, the focus will be on how ILG is "demonstrated," or argued for, as well as the function/s of the concept of ILG in each work. By the end of the Chapter, in tracing the use, function, and perhaps development of the concept of ILG throughout his corpus, it should become clear that ILG functions as the orienting principle to Spinoza's thought as a whole, and not merely in the *Ethics*, where it is explicitly demonstrated and more obviously designated as

---

[7] The structure and geometric method of the *Ethics* suggests that either the first or last of the subjects be the most important. My opinion, obviously, and as indicated by the use of the term 'final', is that it is the latter of these two options. Regardless, that the position of ILG in the *Ethics* is insignificant is highly dubious.

[8] EVP41 justifies the subordinate status of immortality to ILG: "Even if we did not know that our mind is eternal, we should still regard as being of prime importance piety and religion and, to sum up completely, everything which in Part IV we showed to be related to courage and nobility."

[9] 5: Four (4) in the *Ethics*, once (1) in the Letters

[10] 17: Two (2) in the *TIE*, four (4) in the *KV*, ten (10) in the *TTP*, and once (1) in the Letters.

[11] 50: Two (2) in the *KV*, two (2) in the *PPC*, thirty-one (31) in the *TTP*, ten (10) in the *Ethics*, and five (5) in the Letters

[12] *TTP*, Ch. 4, p. 428.

[13] 90 = 5 (n. 9) + 17 (n.10) + 50(n.11) + 18 instances of intellectual love (Four (4) in the *KV*, four (4) in the *TTP*, eight (8) in the *Ethics*, and once in the *PT* and Letters, respectively.

[14] The term 'glory' [g*loria*] from Scripture and 'spiritual contentment' [*animi acquiescentia*] are also approved by Spinoza (EVP36 Schol.). This, and other such instances, further raises the number and frequency.

[15] Novalis.

[16] Goethe.

[17] A paraphrase of Deut. 6:5

[18] In adding all the other terms by which ILG can be referred (>72) to the total number of instances of 'love' (322) + (>84) we get a total of (at least) 478 references to the unqualified concept of love – once every two pages. This is a number exceeded by perhaps one other term, God.

such. The ramifications of this fact for Spinoza's ethical, political, and religious thought will be fleshed out in Chapter IV.

III.A. *Treatise on the Emendation of the Intellect*.

The *Treatise on the Emendation of the Intellect* (*TIE*) is the earliest work of Spinoza's that we have. Scholars date the work to between Spinoza's excommunication of July 27th, 1657, and 1660.[19] The work, though incomplete, and never published during his lifetime, manages to convey a more personal tone in comparison to his later work. But, like his later work, and indeed the majority of his corpus, it is chiefly concerned with the life of the mind, true, scientific, knowledge, as well as with the right method to attain it. Moreover, and again like his later work, it finds the discussion of reason and the human mind in an ethical context, in searching for a "true good… whose acquisition would afford me a continuous and supreme joy to all eternity."[20]

The phrase "intellectual love of God" does not explicitly occur in the *TIE*. Nevertheless, the *TIE* is certainly not irrelevant for our present purposes. Upon examination of the traditional "goods" – riches, honor and sensual pleasure[21] – Spinoza finds that insofar as they are perishable and temporary, so too is our happiness that so depends on them. Seeking a constant and eternal happiness, Spinoza concludes from the idea that "all happiness or unhappiness depends solely on the quality of the object to which we are bound by love"[22] that "love towards a thing eternal and infinite feeds the mind with joy alone, unmixed with any sadness."[23] Now what, I rhetorically ask,

[19] Nadler (1999), p. 175-80. *Works*, p. 1-3. Nadler argues that the *TIE* "probably represents […] an early version, or even a draft, of the methodological parts of *KV*," (Ch. 7, n. 62), but also suggests the "possibility that, as late as the winter of 1674-5, [Spinoza] was still thinking of finishing the *TIE*" (Ch. 12, p. 323).
[20] *TIE*, 1, p. 3. The answer to the search is, to borrow from the title, an emended intellect. More on what this knowledge entails immediately follows.
[21] A trivium with a long history, including one in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition.
[22] *TIE*, 9, p. 5.
[23] *TIE*, 10, p. 5.

could this "thing eternal and infinite" be? Though it is never explicitly labeled as God,[24] the *TIE* puts forth that it is the whole of Nature, conceived as one, that is eternal and infinite.[25] Now, any reader with even the slightest familiarity with Spinoza's philosophy as a whole, or his *Ethics* in particular, would readily identify the conception of Nature as laid out in the *TIE* as very closely resembling the conception of Nature as laid out in the *Ethics*,[26] which he there explicitly identifies with God.[27] However, independent of the *Ethics*, and foregoing the benefit of hindsight, later in his discussion of method in the *TIE*, Spinoza states that "the most perfect method [the understanding of what is a true idea][28] will be one which shows how the mind should be directed according to the standard of a given idea of the most perfect Being,"[29] and that "at the outset this must be our chief objective, to arrive at the knowledge of such a Being as speedily as possible"[30] – language, along with the predicates of "infinite" and "eternal," more approaching that of traditional theology. Finally, our supreme good,[31] and "highest human perfection"[32] is defined in the *TIE* as joy arising from "the knowledge of the union which the mind has with the whole of Nature," "together with other individuals, if possible."[33] Putting these passages together, we find that the one eternal, infinite and most perfect being in the *TIE* is quite simply then the whole of Nature, and our highest perfection

---

[24] Nadler (1999), p. 180.
[25] *TIE*, 13, p. 6, for but one instance.
[26] Some other commonalities between the two works include the fixed and determinate order of nature, the relativism of good and evil, and perhaps even parallelism (Cf. *TIE*, 41, p. 12). To this list of commonalities between the *TIE* and the *Ethics*, if not Spinoza's work as a whole, I would add ILG, as this chapter seeks to prove.
[27] For the famous doctrine of *Deus sive Natura*, see: EIV Pref., P4; Cf. *TTP* Ch. 6, p. 447.
[28] *TIE*, 37, p. 11.
[29] *TIE*, 38, p. 11.
[30] *TIE*, 49, p. 13.
[31] Defined in this work as the condition of enjoying our true good, along with other people, to the extent this is possible (*TIE* 13, p. 5-6). This term is more explicitly identified with ILG in later works.
[32] *TIE*, 16, p. 6.
[33] *TIE*, 13, p. 5-6. The inclusion of a socio-political dimension to our supreme good and happiness is of major importance, and will be drawn upon in Part III where I will argue for and develop a socio-political dimension to ILG. This is not the only time in the *TIE* that this socio-political dimension is discussed either. Cf. *TIE*, 14, p. 6, "my own happiness involves my making an effort to persuade many others to think as I do… To bring this about, it is necessary… (2) to establish such a social order as will enable as many as possible to reach this goal [of ILG]." That Spinoza asserts a universal socio-political dimension to ILG even in an unfinished earlier work seems to go against the idea that Spinoza's humanism was elitist or "highly individualistic." Cf. Den Uyl (2008).

and supreme good is the enjoyment of the eternal knowledge of the mind as interrelated within the infinite whole of Nature. The *TIE* is not so far from the *Ethics* in its *weltanschauung*.

From these scattered bits, let us take stock of Spinoza's argument for what is effectively ILG in the *TIE*. Insofar as happiness depends on the object known and loved, eternal happiness must depend on an eternal object. This much is a simple result of Spinoza's psychology. This eternal object, for Spinoza, is the infinite whole of Nature, conceived as one, the most perfect Being. However, as shown earlier by linking several passages of the *TIE,* Spinoza's conception of Nature in the *TIE* bears similar predicates as the traditional theological conception of God does (i.e. eternal, infinite, perfect), and closely resembles what he later in the *Ethics* explicitly designates as God (or Nature). Thus, if the immediate lack of explicit identification of God with Nature is not an obstacle, which I don't think it is or ought to be, the concept of ILG has a major presence in the *TIE*. It functions, if only ideally, because it alone can guarantee and in fact is universal and eternal happiness, as "a new guiding principle,"[34] the "one end and goal" of all the sciences,[35] of "all our activities and likewise our thoughts,"[36] as well as the basis for the establishment of social order.[37] To conclude, in the *TIE,* the concept of ILG functions as nothing short of the ideal *telos* for all of humanity insofar as it alone, based on Spinoza's psychology of the affect of happiness, can lead one and all to an eternal joy and happiness through and in the knowledge and love of Nature.[38]

---

[34] *TIE*, 3, p. 3. The novelty of this principle is highly dubitable, as Chapter 2 above, if nothing else, can readily testify to. Cf. Wolfson (1934), Vol. II, p. 273ff. Perhaps, then, the novelty is not so much a question of originality but one of its dire lack of prevalence in society, at least in Spinoza's eyes. The phrase "guiding principle," however, is essential to my argument at large here in the dissertation and will be taken up below.

[35] *TIE*, 16, p. 6. This absolute claim would, I assume for now, include political science, however conceived.

[36] *TIE*, 16, p. 6.

[37] *TIE*, 14, p. 6. This again goes against the highly elitist or individualistic reading of Spinoza's humanism or even his politics.

[38] Spinoza's concept of Nature and its relationship to God at this stage, as with one's understanding of Spinoza's concept of the relationship in the *Ethics*, hinges in large part on the degree to which one understands the use of the term 'God' as rhetorical or exoteric and Spinoza as a radical materialist. Using ILG as a lens would suggest that it is at least not merely rhetorical, insofar as Spinoza certainly came to the identification of the two at least later in life from the original position of ILG, of knowing and loving God, first.

III.B. *Short Treatise on God, Humankind, and Well-Being.*

The *Short Treatise on God, Humankind, and His Well-Being* (*KV*)[39] was begun by Spinoza around 1660, at the behest of his friends with whom he had been discussing the various philosophies of the time, especially that of Descartes,[40] and even his own burgeoning ideas. Though he seems to have debated publishing the *KV* at several points in the early 1660's, especially after numerous revisions throughout 1661, its origin as a kind of handbook of his ideas for his friends, its novel (read: radical) ideas and the political clime within which it would have been published, precluded its wider dissemination.[41]

In the KV we find many ideas that have come to be regarded as Spinozistic staples, despite occasionally being, in comparison to the *Ethics* at least, in embryonic form. Some of these ideas include those familiar to us from the *TIE*, such as the fixed and determinate order of Nature,[42] and the relativism of the values of good and evil.[43] Others, such as the identification of God with Nature, and of which infinite attributes may be predicated, have their first real presentation.[44] Moreover, the basic format familiar to us from the *Ethics*, of discussing God, then man, first metaphysically as a mode of substance then epistemologically and psychologically, so as to discuss, finally, his well-being, is found here as well. Considering these substantial parallels, it should come as no surprise, then, that Spinoza concludes the KV with the idea that humanity's well-being, indeed our "supreme happiness"[45] or "blessedness,"[46] is to be found in the intellectual love of God. Let us turn to the text.

---

[39] This abbreviation is based on the Dutch title of the work of *Korte Verhandeling*
[40] Spinoza's intimate knowledge of Descartes philosophy is especially evidenced in his *Principles of Cartesian Philosophy* (1663), which will be discussed immediately following the *KV*.
[41] Nadler (1999), p. 186, 190-1. *Works* (2002), p. 31-2. *KV* II.XXVI, *Works*, p. 102; Ep. 6, *Works*, p. 776, and Ep. 13, *Works*, p. 793.
[42] *KV* I.IV, *Works*, p.51-2;
[43] *KV* I.X, *Works*, p. 59-60; II.IV, *Works*, p. 67.
[44] *KV* I.II; App. 1: P4 Cor., *Works*, p. 104.
[45] *KV* II.III, *Works*, p. 65; II.XIX, *Works*, p. 86; II.XXVI, *Works*, p. 100.

In KV Part I, Chapter II, we find two short dialogues relevant to our purposes. Hardly the dramaturge, Spinoza lets the characters in these compositions serve more as mouthpieces of propositions of his philosophy, than as drivers of any real plot. In the First Dialogue: Between the Understanding, Love, Reason and Desire, we have a couple of familiar propositions from the *TIE*, more or less blurted out by the characters Love and Understanding: that love's essence and perfection depend on the perfection of the understanding, and that the understanding, seeking its own perfection, considers "Nature only in its totality as infinite and supremely perfect."[47] In the Second Dialogue, we have Theophilus, a name which means "God loving," declaring that since "God is known only through himself," for "a clear idea of God as shall unite us with him in such a way that it will not let us love anything beside him… so as to depend immediately on him" we need "only such a body in Nature whose idea is necessary in order to represent God immediately."[48] In other words, quite early in the *KV*, we already have a rough working of the concept of ILG, insofar as love and understanding are perfected through knowledge of God or Nature.

Part II, Chapter V, of the *KV* is on the affect of love, and in it we get our first definition of it, "which is nothing else than the enjoyment of a thing and union therewith."[49] Expanding on this definition, and drawing on previous discussions on the affects of various kinds of knowledge,[50] Spinoza finds that love "arises from the idea and knowledge that we have of a thing; and according as the thing shows itself greater and more glorious, so also is our love greater."[51] In turn, love is divided into three according to the quality of the types of objects loved: transient in themselves, non-transient through their cause, and eternal in itself; and the rhetorical question "now which of

---

[46] *KV* II.XII, *Works*, p. 94; II.XXVI, *Works*, p. 99.
[47] *KV* I.II, *Works*, p. 46.
[48] *KV* I.II, *Works*, p. 50.
[49] *KV* II.V, *Works*, p. 68.
[50] *KV* II.II-IV.
[51] *KV* II.V, *Works*, p. 68; II.II, *Works*, p. 63.

these three kinds of objects are we to choose or to reject?" is asked.[52] Insofar as love is a union with the object known, unifying with a transient thing makes our joy resulting from our love transient as well, and thus turns to "wretchedness" or sadness. Union with a non-transient thing through another leads us to contemplation of that on which it depends on for its non-transience or eternity, namely God. Thus, "in [God], since he is perfect, our love must necessarily rest"[53] – a chain of reasoning for the concept of ILG that should be familiar to us from our discussion of the TIE above.

As a result of the more substantial treatment that ILG, as well as some of its component concepts, receives in the *KV*, we are also introduced to several other aspects of ILG, most often in the context of Spinoza's developing theory of the emotions. One such aspect of particular relevance is that there are two ways to free ourselves from love, or in fact any emotion, namely: "either by getting to know something better, or by discovering that the loved object… brings in its train much woe and disaster."[54] In turn, the remedial aspect of ILG with regards to the perturbations of the emotions is highlighted.[55] For: "when man comes to love God who always is and remains immutable, then it is impossible for him to fall into this welter of passions"[56] and that ILG "frees us from Sorrow, from Despair, from Envy, from Terror, and other evil passions, which, as we shall presently say, constitute the real hell itself."[57] The socio-political dimension to ILG is not absent from the *KV* either. In Chapter XVIII, we find that ILG "inspires us with a real love of our neighbour, it shapes us so that we never hate him, nor are we angry with him, but love to help him,

---

[52] *KV* II.V, *Works*, p. 69.
[53] *KV* II.V, *Works*, p. 69.
[54] *KV* II.V, *Works*, p. 68. Rehashed in II.XIX, *Works*, p. 88-9.
[55] In the case of ILG itself, the idea of a remedy is absurd insofar as ILG precludes the idea of needing to be remedied. Since the knowledge and love of God will never, by definition, and insofar as God is eternal and infinite, lead directly to woe, disaster or any other passive (read: negative) emotion, and the fact that there is nothing greater than God to contemplate, because Nature exhausts existence, the idea of another stronger emotion overpowering the joy of ILG is absurd. It is the highest emotion, joy, love, knowledge and state of being. It requires no remedy.
[56] *KV* II.XIV, *Works*, p. 78-9.
[57] *KV* II.XVIII, *Works*, p. 85

and to improve his condition" and that ILG "serves to promote the greatest Common Good"[58] insofar as it best fosters an egalitarian beneficence. In other words, and this is no small assertion, ILG is the best and true basis for tolerance and charity.[59] Another major aspect of ILG in the *KV* is its concomitant phenomenon the immortality of the soul. Spinoza defines the soul in the *KV* as "an Idea which is in the thinking thing, arising from the reality of a thing which exists in Nature."[60] The soul, in turn, through its knowledge and love "can become united either with the body of which it is the Idea, or with God"[61] and if God, i.e. an eternal and immutable being, "it must also remain unchangeable and lasting," i.e. immortal.[62] Thus, as a consequence of the union between the human mind and God, ILG results in the eternity or immortality of the soul. Finally, and relevant to later discussions, we learn that, for Spinoza, love is a unifying force in a very real sense, insofar as the loving knower and the object known and loved can be rationally conceived as a single whole.[63]

To sum up, the concept of ILG is a major one in the *KV* and is that towards which the whole work can be said to argue for. It constitutes our titular well-being and, once again, our supreme happiness. It is a union arising from knowledge of God, which, insofar as its object, God or Nature, is immutable and eternal, results in a constant and eternal affect of joy or happiness. It is the sovereign remedy for all the emotions. It is the basis of tolerance, charity and the common good. Moreover, the eternity of the mind results from the union of the human mind with God through ILG. To put it differently, but once again, in the KV, the concept of ILG functions as a rationally

---

[58] *KV* II.XVIII, *Works*, p. 85.
[59] The socio-political dimension to ILG, and its being the basis of tolerance and charity, will be taken up in Part III, especially Chapter 8. That tolerance, a cornerstone of modern liberal society, depends on ILG, something arguably lacking in modern society, is of poignant interest, and will be taken up in the concluding Part IV.
[60] *KV* II.XXIII, *Works*, p. 95.
[61] *KV* II.XXIII, *Works*, p. 95. Italics mine.
[62] This argument for the immortality of the soul smacks of medieval rationalism, the same medieval rationalism Spinoza is supposedly so opposed to in the *TTP*, especially Chs. 7 & 14. Cf. Wolfson (1934), Vol. II, pp. 289-322, for a medieval contextualization.
[63] *KV* II.V, *Works*, p. 69, "…by this [love] we mean such a union whereby both the lover and what is loved become one and the same thing, or together constitute one whole.

argued for telos for humanity, on the individual and socio-political levels, and this time on the eschatological as well. It is the basis for joy and happiness, tolerance and charity, immortality and the true understanding of existence as a unified whole. To use common parlance: it is kind of a big deal.

III.C. *Principles of Cartesian Philosophy + Metaphysical Thoughts*.

Spinoza's *Principles of Cartesian Philosophy* (*PPC*) was his first publication, and the only one to be published in his name. Appearing in 1663, the work is the result of Spinoza's activities as a professional tutor for a Leiden University student, and the behest of the same group of friends referenced earlier with whom he enjoyed discussing the philosophies of the day. Appended to the PPC we find the Metaphysical Thoughts (*CM*), where Spinoza reflects on the preceding and gives expression to some of his own philosophical ideas.[64] The concept of ILG is present even here, and while it is discussed within the context of Spinoza's explanation of Descartes' philosophy, it is supported with reference to his own thoughts, a small chapter on God's eternity, as contained in the *CM*.[65] Thus, and early in the *PPC*, we find Spinoza, in expounding on the idea that the existence of God is known solely from the consideration of his nature, claiming that the love of God and the highest blessedness arises precisely from this knowledge of God's nature, "which is of course, the first foundation of human blessedness."[66]

[64] Nadler (1999), p. 204-12. *Works*, p. 108-9.
[65] CM II.I. Moreover, to separate Spinoza completely from his presentation of Descartes' philosophy would be a fool's errand.
[66] *PPC* I.P5 Schol., *Works*, p. 133-4.

III.D. *Theological-Political Treatise*.

Begun by autumn 1665,[67] Spinoza's *Theological-Political Treatise* (*TTP*) is the second work of Spinoza's to be officially published during his lifetime (The *PPC* + *CM* (1663), but the first work of his own thought. Even then, it was published clandestinely in 1670, under a false imprint, and using a pseudonym.[68] Despite the caution put into printing the work, the *TTP* was almost immediately and unanimously banned by most states of Europe.[69] Spinoza himself was, in turn, charged with atheism,[70] and a curiously ironic and unfortunate result considering his expressed intention to demonstrate the exact opposite in the work.[71] Nevertheless, the *TTP* is perhaps one of the most influential books of the Enlightenment, and in turn the modern era.[72] In the *TTP*, *inter-alia*, Spinoza argues for the freedom to philosophize as well as the right to free speech as both entirely in line with and in fact the basis of peace and piety in a state.[73] He does this, in the first fifteen chapters at least, by arguing for the removal of all authority, political or otherwise, to censure these rights of expression, from the jurisdictional domain of theology and institutional religion, themselves seen in this work, and others,[74] as the largest threat to political authority and stability generally speaking.

---

[67] Nadler (1999), p. 133, puts forth the possibility that Spinoza began working on parts of the *TTP*, most likely the parts dealing with the Bible, as early as the late 1650s.
[68] *Works*, pp. 383-4.
[69] Cf.: Fritz Bamberger, *Spinoza and Anti-Spinoza Literature: The Printed Literature of Spinozism, 1665-1832* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2003); Nadler's 2011 volume focuses more on the contemporaneous reactions to the publication of the *TTP*.
[70] A far harsher charge then than it may be now, atheism meant something much different in the 17th century. In lay usage it was often levied at any ideas deemed immoral, abused to cover things one disagreed with, but chief among those things was its more technical meaning of the denial of the supernatural.
[71] *Ep*. 30, *Works*, pp. 843-4.
[72] No-one makes this point better than Jonathan Israel (2001, 2006). There is also a growing literature on Spinoza's influence on an incredibly wide range of topics, themes, thinkers and issues, from bible criticism and liberal democracy to German idealism and modern Jewish thought. The majority of that influence was born out by his *TTP*. Schwartz' (2012) study of the image of Spinoza in modern Jewish thought, as well as most evidence from the *Pantheismusstreit* and the scholarship on it, bears evidence against any kind of sustained or systematic study of Spinoza's writings, or at least the *Ethics* for at least one hundred years after his death. Cf. the literature review (I.1.B.) above for discussion of and notes on the first and second periods in the reception history of Spinoza and his concept of ILG.
[73] *TTP*, Title Page, *Works*, p. 387.
[74] In addition to the *TP* and my discussion of it below, *Ep*. 30, *Works*, p. 844, especially supports this claim: "The prejudices of the theologians. For I know that these are the main obstacles which prevent men from giving their minds to philosophy."

Spinoza begins the work by discussing and subtly redefining key religious concepts such as prophecy,[75] prophets,[76] divine law,[77] and miracles,[78] with his own developing metaphysics of the *Ethics* subtly but ever present in the backdrop.[79] Spinoza then develops a critical hermeneutic,[80] the foundation of modern Biblical criticism, that treats Scripture[81] as just another natural phenomenon,[82] or "just as if it were an investigation into lines, planes and bodies."[83] Following hermeneutics, the Divine authorship of various books of Scripture is debated,[84] as well as Scripture's transmission history.[85] Finally, after arguing that there is little to no philosophical (read: scientific) insight in Scripture, only moral,[86] and that faith in itself has nothing to do with philosophy,[87] the entire theological endeavour, and thus institutional religion, is split off from the rational endeavour,[88] thereby preserving the freedom to philosophize and the right to free speech from theological censure. The final five chapters of the *TTP*, vis-à-vis the more deconstructive first fifteen, take up a positive discussion of the origins of the rights of the individual and the sovereign power,[89] political

---

[75] *TTP* Ch. 1.
[76] *TTP* Ch. 2.
[77] *TTP* Ch. 4.
[78] *TTP* Ch. 6.
[79] Melamed, Yitzhak Y. "The metaphysics of the *Theological-Political Treatise*" in *Spinoza's Theological Political Treatise: A Critical Guide* (2010). In fact, the whole volume is based in large part on this very connection between the two works. Cf. Introduction; Curley (1990) builds on this same connection between the two works and reads the *TTP* as a prolegomena to the *Ethics*.
[80] *TTP* Ch. 7.
[81] Spinoza uses this term [*scriptura*] to refer to both the Hebrew and Christian Bibles. I intend to use the term to cover both canons as well.
[82] "I hold that the method of interpreting Scripture is no different from the method of interpreting Nature, and is in fact in complete accord with it" *TTP* Ch. 7, p. 457.
[83] EIII Pref., p. 278. Though the quotation is from the *Ethics*, and regards his study of the emotions, Spinoza's naturalizing tendencies are not restricted to that work alone, and the naturalism of the quotation is apt to the point.
[84] *TTP* Chs. 8-11.
[85] *TTP* Ch. 12.
[86] *TTP* Ch. 13. This raises the question of the status or even existence of a science of morals in Spinoza, not absolutely speaking, but in terms of human systems of morality. This question, however, takes us too far afield. Moreover, the possibility of a scientific study of the morals of the prophets, though intriguing, will have to wait as well.
[87] *TTP* Ch. 14.
[88] *TTP* Ch. 15.
[89] *TTP* Ch. 16, 17.

lessons we can garner from Scripture,[90] as well as the jurisdictional limits regarding ceremonial law,[91] and the freedom to philosophize and the right to free speech.[92] It is a massively important book in the history of political thought specifically and even the history of ideas more generally, but for our present purposes the above outline will have to suffice.

Due to the political and often rhetorical[93] nature of the work, the concept of ILG is most often referred to as 'blessedness' in the *TTP*.[94] Moreover, the majority of instances of ILG occur in *Chapter 4: Divine Law*, wherein Spinoza discusses and defines the various types of law: the inviolable laws of nature that follow necessarily from the nature of the thing (Divine Laws); violable human laws that have ILG as their aim (Divine laws), a category itself divisible into human law and divine law, with the aims of the good of the state or the self, respectively; and violable human laws that do not have ILG as their aim (laws).[95] Thus, with the introduction of the question of values, of what is our supreme good, Spinoza turns to a discussion of the supreme good, or blessedness, so that we may better design and direct our Divine laws. In line with the rest of Spinoza's writings, our supreme good is ILG and the argument for it should be familiar:

"Since our intellect forms the better part of us, it is evident that, if we wish to seek what is definitely to our advantage, we should endeavour above all to perfect it as far as we can, for in its perfection must consist our supreme good. Now since all our knowledge, and the certainty that banishes every

---

[90] *TTP* Ch. 18, but a bit of Ch. 17 as well.
[91] *TTP* Ch. 19.
[92] *TTP* Ch. 20.
[93] By rhetorical I intend not demonstratively or geometrically argued but written with a persuasive prose. For a stronger reading of the term 'rhetorical', see: Strauss (1930 (German), 1965 (English) Preface; 1935 (German), 1995 (English)) for a reading of Spinoza's entire critique of religion, and even his Enlightenment endeavours, and perhaps the whole of position of modernity as mere rhetoric, and ultimately unpersuasive in refuting the position of orthodoxy or the pre-modern mind more generally.
[94] The term 'blessedness' appears a total of thirty-one (31) times in the *TTP*, ILG appears four (4) times, and 'supreme good' appears ten (10)
[95] The capitalization of these different terms shall be indicative of their different meanings. Divine laws and laws are both statutes (*ius*) (lower case 'l' in 'law') in that they depend on human will, are violable, and intend some end (Ch. 4, p. 426), with the kind of end aimed at being their specific difference.

possible doubt, depend solely on the knowledge of God - because, firstly, without God nothing can be or be conceived, and secondly, everything can be called into doubt as long as we have no clear and distinct idea of God - it follows that our supreme good and perfection depends solely on the knowledge of God… This, then, is the sum of our supreme good and blessedness, to wit, the knowledge and love of God."[96]

Before moving on, however, the *TTP* teaches us a few more, almost entirely negative, things about ILG. In Chapter 3, wherein Spinoza challenges the Jewish notion of "chosenness" we find Spinoza declaring that ILG is available to all, and if the Jews were in fact "chosen" it was not with respect to their knowledge and love of God.[97] Thus, we find that ILG does not depend on some special covenant or even a national disposition, but is a universal prerogative. Returning to Chapter 4, after introducing, arguing for and defining ILG as our supreme good, we find a discussion of what ILG does not depend on, namely: the fear of punishment, the hope of reward, or historical narratives.[98] It is its own incentive, its own reward.[99] In Chapter 5, Spinoza adds one more item to the list: ceremonial observances.[100] In Chapter 6, in light of the well-known fact that even false prophets can perform miracles, thereby undermining the certainty which they supposedly provide, Spinoza finds ILG as the sole guarantor of the legitimacy of miracles and of prophets that depend on them.[101] Thus, we find that ILG does not depend on miracles. In Chapter 7, towards the end, after developing and applying his own hermeneutic, Spinoza briefly turns to questions of censorship, coercion and jurisdiction, and states that "it is an absolute fact that nobody can be constrained to a

---

[96] *TTP* Ch. 4, p. 427-8.
[97] *TTP* Ch. 3, p. 424.
[98] *TTP* Ch. 4, p. 428-9.
[99] Cf. EVP42
[100] *TTP* Ch. 5, p. 436 & 440.
[101] *TTP* Ch. 6, p. 449.

state of blessedness by force or law"[102] in an attempt to drastically limit the jurisdiction of the theologians and institutional religion. Thus, speaking this time of coercion, ILG cannot depend on the fear of punishment. Finally, In Chapter 14, we have an indication of the social dimension to ILG insofar as "it is also undeniable that he who by God's commandments *loves his neighbor* as himself is truly obedient and blessed according to the law,"[103] with the later qualification that "blessedness simply through obedience without understanding"[104] is impossible.

To sum up, the argument for ILG in the *TTP* is much the same as we've seen before. Based on an analysis of human nature and the human mind, as well as the range of objects available for its intellection, the intellectual love of God is deemed to be the most natural for and thus the most suited to and in turn the most advantageous and beneficial to all of humanity. Of especial political importance is the idea that all laws may be absolutely judged and valued based on the extent to which they can be said to manifest or guarantee our supreme good or ILG in its citizenry. Thus, despite the relativism of values in Spinoza's thought, human nature in fact has its inherently determined good, namely, ILG, which has significant ramifications for both the private (or ethical) and public (or religious and political) spheres.[105]

III.E. *Ethics*.

Spinoza already began working on the *Ethics* by the end of 1661. By early 1663 there is evidence of an early draft of Part I "On God" amongst his friends. After experimenting with a mathematical or geometric method of exposition, as seen in the *PPC* and the Appendix to the *KV*,

[102] *TTP* Ch. 7, 470.
[103] *TTP* Ch. 14, p. 515.
[104] *TTP* Ch. 15, p. 523.
[105] See: Chapter IV below.

and finding the presentation of his philosophy wanting,[106] Spinoza continued to rework his system. In 1665, in three parts then, with Part III containing most of what we find in Parts IV and V of the final version, the draft, though relatively complete, was put aside for the purposes of writing what would become the *TTP*. Though returning to the *Ethics* after publication of the *TTP* in 1670, he did begin work on both a *Political-Treatise* and a *Hebrew Grammar* as well before his death in 1677. Upon his death, and at his own request, the contents of his bureau, including a draft of the *Ethics* in five parts, were dispatched to his friends for safe-keeping and eventual publication in the *Opera Posthuma*.[107]

The *Ethics* contains the fullest expression of almost all things Spinoza. From God, the infinite attributes (of which we know two, thought and extension), and the modes, to the human mind and body, the imagination, reason, and the 3rd kind of knowledge, from the affects and their regulation, to human freedom, autonomy, virtue, and blessedness, from substance monism and absolute determinism and necessitarianism to joy, happiness, and ethics, everything is deduced solely from previous propositions, axioms, and definitions. It is in the *Ethics* wherein Spinoza presents his mature philosophy, defining and demonstrating the various component concepts of it and of ILG most completely; it is in the *Ethics* that Spinoza affords us his most complete argument for and discussions of ILG itself; finally, it is also in the *Ethics* that ILG encounters its more serious difficulties of interpretation. "For I do not presume that I have found the best philosophy, but I know that what I understand is the true one."[108]

We now turn to a presentation of the propositions asserting, demonstrating, and developing the concept of ILG in the *Ethics*. Each proposition will be followed by a brief discussion of it, with some mention of the propositions weaved in between them, but focusing on the role and function

[106] Nadler (1999), p. 201.
[107] *Works*, pp. 213-215.
[108] Ep. 76, p. 949.

of the concept of ILG in Spinoza's system. The question of consistency with the rest of the *Ethics* will be turned to afterward, in order to better allow for the discussion to take ILG as cardinal.

III.E.i. The Propositions of the Intellectual Love of God.

> EVp15: He who clearly and distinctly understands himself and his emotions loves God, and the more so the more he understands himself and his emotions.
> Demonstration: He who clearly and distinctly understands himself and his emotions feels pleasure (EIIIp53) accompanied by the idea of God (preceding Pr.). So (EIII Def. of Emotions 6) he loves God, and, by the same reasoning, the more so the more he understands himself and his emotions.

The first proposition to have ILG in it is EVp15.[109] The proposition seeks to prove the causal and proportional relation between knowledge of the self and the emotions and the love of God. It establishes the link between knowledge and love, between the 'I' and the 'L' in ILG. It holds that the love of God is proportional to the adequacy of our self-knowledge. It is based in the idea that God is the cause of the experience of pleasure resulting from said knowledge. The demonstration applies the mechanism of the emotions to the fact that God is the cause of all things, including all things that cause us pleasure, i.e. knowledge, and in fact the cause of our very selves, to derive a corresponding and proportional love of God to our knowledge of God.

> EVp16: This love toward God is bound to hold chief place in the mind.
> Demonstration: This love is associated with all the affections of the body (EVp14), and is fostered by them all (EVp15), and so (EVp11) it is bound to hold chief place in the mind.

This proposition seems to put forth a normative claim in the "bound to hold" (*occupare debet*) of the proposition. If so then it ascribes a "chief" or maximal (*maxime*) value to ILG. If it is not normative then it is certainly descriptive. If it is descriptive it seems to be describing the love toward God of

[109] All earlier references to ILG occur in prefaces, scholia, and the like, and are usually by other synonymous terms.

EVp15 as something generally increasing, growing, maximizing, perhaps even developing, as its place in the mind achieves the chief or maximal place. Its proof depends on the idea that the love of God is "associated with" and "fostered by" (*junctus* and *fovetur*, respectively) all the affections of the body, as the cause of all experience adequately understood. In making the chief place in the mind one that is "bound" to be taken up by ILG, it becomes an ideal, perhaps the ideal.

> EVp17: God is without passive emotions, and he is not affected with any emotion of pleasure or pain.
> Demonstration: All ideas, insofar as they are related to God, are true (EIIIp32), that is (EIID4), they are adequate. Thus (Gen. Def. of Emotions), God is without passive emotions. Again, God cannot pass to a state of greater or less perfection (EIp20C2I), and so (Def. of Emotions 2 and 3) he is not affected with any emotion of pleasure or pain.
> Corollary: Strictly speaking, God does not love or hate anyone. For God (preceding Pr.) is not affected with any emotion of pleasure or pain, and consequently (Def. of Emotions 6 and 7) he neither loves nor hates anyone.

EVp17 asserts that God is without passivity, pleasure or pain. To prove this Spinoza makes reference again to the general mechanism of the emotions wherein pleasure and pain are held to be experiences of passivity in their dependence on an external cause. But God's knowledge is related to God alone and thus adequate. Moreover, being absolutely adequate, it undergoes no transition, neither towards a greater or lesser perfection, and thus there is no pleasure or pain. The corollary is a pedantic follow up, reinforcing the "strict" definition of the emotions of pleasure and pain, love and hate, and their inapplicability to God. This proposition gives rise to a later contradiction when God is said to have an intellectual love, certainly a pleasure if there is any in Spinoza's system, and is one of the problems indicated earlier in I.C, and will be returned to at the end of this sub-chapter.

> EVp18: Nobody can hate God.
> Demonstration: The idea of God which is in us is adequate and perfect (EIIp46, 47). Therefore, insofar as we contemplate God, we are active (EIIIp3). Consequently (EIIIp59), there can be no pain accompanied by the idea of God; that is (Def. of Emotions 7), nobody can hate God.
> Corollary: Love toward God cannot turn to hatred.

> Scholium: It may be objected that in understanding God to be the cause of all things we thereby consider God to be the cause of pain. To this I reply that insofar as we understand the causes of pain, it ceases to be a passive emotion (EVp3); that is (EIIIp59), to that extent it ceases to be pain. So insofar as we understand God to be the cause of pain, to that extent we feel pleasure.

The idea that nobody can hate God is a curious counterpoint to the idea, central to this dissertation, that ILG is ubiquitous in Spinoza. For, EVp18 would seem to hold that there is nothing in existence that is counter to ILG. There is no corresponding hate to the love of ILG. This is proven through reference to the idea that our innate knowledge of God is adequate and perfect, thus making it an active idea in and through us. By the mechanism of the emotions, our knowledge of God being an active idea precludes its being the cause of pain which in turn precludes hate of the cause of the active idea. The corollary, implicitly drawing on the correlation between knowledge, activity, and love, precludes hatred of God as resulting directly from the idea of God. If I may add a brief addendum to this, it would be that all hate towards God is thus based in a false, inadequate, or imagined idea of God. It is an illusion, entirely independent of any adequate idea of God we may have and is targeted at something that ultimately doesn't exist as conceived. The scholium, as is frequently the case with Spinoza's scholia, offers us an interesting observation regarding pleasure and pain and their relationship to our knowledge. In essence, an original hypothesis is corrected through reference to how a transition from passivity to activity results from knowledge of the cause of the original experience. It concludes that since knowledge of God is always active, and cannot be passive, it cannot ever be the cause of pain, which is a transition from activity to passivity. However, at the end, it deduces the crucial idea that pain can be turned into pleasure simply by understanding it to be caused by God. The remedy to pain, the negative emotions, lies in ILG.

> EVp19: He who loves God cannot endeavor that God should love him in return. Demonstration: If a man were so to endeavor, he would therefore desire (EVp17C) that God whom he loves should not be God, and consequently (EIIIp19) he would desire to feel pain, which is absurd (EIIIp28). Therefore he who loves God . . . etc.

This proposition puts forth the idea that an endeavour on behalf of God's love is either impossible or ill advised, or, more likely, both. Its proof hinges in part on the idea that such an endeavour, properly understood, would indicate a desire to change the very nature of God. All things, for Spinoza, are determined by God from the eternal laws of Nature. God's causing something to be different than it would otherwise have been determined to be from God's own eternal nature indicates a change in this same eternal essence, something absurd for Spinoza. That it is done in return for an act, any act, but especially a human act, is equally absurd. This would entail a finite act in finite time affecting the infinite and eternal. Though this is all impossible and absurd as just explained, Spinoza focuses here more on the fact that such a desire, even were it possible, would be a desire for pain if properly understood. This is itself absurd for a conatus or finite mode since the essence of a conatus or finite mode is a striving to persevere and thus it cannot act against its own interest. Moreover, insofar as the idea of God is an active idea it cannot cause pain, regardless of our misconceived endeavour that it ultimately do so. This proposition EVp19 also gives rise to one of the problems facing ILG, discussed earlier in I.C, and that will be returned to towards the end of this sub-chapter.

> EVp20: This love toward God cannot be tainted with emotions of envy or jealousy, but is the more fostered as we think more men to be joined to God by this same bond of love.
> Demonstration: This love toward God is the highest good that we can aim at according to the dictates of reason (EIVp28) and is available to all men (EIVp36), and we desire that all men should enjoy it (EIVp37). Therefore (Def. of Emotions 2 3), it cannot be stained by the emotion of envy, nor again by the emotion of jealousy (EVp18 and Def. of Jealousy, q.v. in EIIIp36S). On the contrary (EIIIp31), it is the more fostered as we think more men to be enjoying it.
> Scholium: We can in the same way demonstrate that there is no emotion directly contrary to this love by which this love can be destroyed; and so we may conclude that this love toward God is the most constant of all emotions, and insofar as it is related to the body it cannot be destroyed except together with the body. As to its nature insofar as it is related solely to the mind, this we shall examine later on. With this I have completed the account of all the remedies for the emotions: that is, all

that the mind, considered solely in itself, can do against the emotions. From this it is clear that the power of the mind over the emotions consists:
1. In the very knowledge of the emotions (EVp4S).
2. In detaching the emotions from the thought of their external cause, which we imagine confusedly. (EVp2, EVp4S)
3. In the matter of time, in respect of which the affections that are related to things we understand are superior to those which are related to things that we conceive in a confused or fragmentary way (EVp7).
4. In the number of causes whereby those affections are fostered which are related to the common properties of things, or to God (EVp9, 11).
5. Lastly, in the order wherein the mind can arrange its emotions and associate them one with another (EVp10S, EVp12-14).

But in order that this power of the mind over the emotions may be better understood, it is important to note that we call emotions strong when we compare the emotion of one man with that of another, and when we see one man more than another assailed by the same emotion, or when we compare with one another the emotions of the same man and find that the same man is affected or moved by one emotion more than by another. For (EIVp5) the strength of every emotion is defined by the power of an external cause as compared with our own power.

Now the power of the mind is defined solely by knowledge, its weakness or passivity solely by the privation of knowledge; that is, it is measured by the extent to which its ideas are said to be inadequate. Hence it follows that that mind is most passive whose greatest part is constituted by inadequate ideas, so that it is characterized more by passivity than by activity. On the other hand, that mind is most active whose greatest part is constituted by adequate ideas, so that even if the latter mind contains as many inadequate ideas as the former, it is characterized by those ideas which are attributed to human virtue rather than by those that point to human weakness.

Again, it should be noted that emotional distress and unhappiness have their origin especially in excessive love toward a thing subject to considerable instability, a thing which we can never completely possess. For nobody is disturbed or anxious about any thing unless he loves it, nor do wrongs, suspicions, enmities, etc. arise except from love toward things which nobody can truly possess.

So from this we readily conceive how effective against the emotions is clear and distinct knowledge, and especially the third kind of knowledge (for which see EIIp47S) whose basis is the knowledge of God. Insofar as they are passive emotions, if it does not completely destroy them (EVp3, EVp4S), at least it brings it about that they constitute the least part of the mind (EVp14). Again, it begets love toward something immutable and eternal (EVp15) which we can truly possess (EIIp45), and which therefore cannot be defiled by any of the faults that are to be found in the common sort of love, but can continue to grow more and more (EVp15) and engage the greatest part of the mind (EVp16) and pervade it.

And now I have completed all that concerns this present life; for, as I said at the beginning of this Scholium, in this brief account I have covered all the remedies against the emotions. This everyone can see who gives his mind to the contents of this Scholium, and likewise to the definitions of the mind and its emotions, and lastly

> to EIIIp1 and 3. So it is now time to pass on to those matters that concern the duration of the mind without respect to the body.

EVp20 is a significant proposition in the *Ethics*, not least because of the last paragraph of the scholium where Spinoza claims to have concluded his discussions pertaining to "this present life," suggesting an afterlife to be discussed. The proposition itself puts forth that envy and jealousy cannot negate ILG and is proven by drawing on three points proven earlier in EIV – that reason upholds ILG as the highest good, that ILG is available to everyone, and that we desire it for everyone – that together preclude envy and jealousy from arising from ILG. In fact, being infinitely and universally available as a resource for our pleasure, individually and collectively speaking, ILG is increased the more we understand others to share in it. A rising tide (of ILG) raises all boats. After asserting that the fact that there is nothing that can negate ILG can be proven along the same lines as the foregoing, Spinoza concludes that ILG is the most constant of the emotions, and that only insofar as it is related to the body is it destroyed when the body is destroyed. This leaves room for its not being ultimately destroyed, something Spinoza will return to shortly, insofar as this possibility no longer pertains to this (bodily) life. The scholium to EVp20 then offers us a summary of the remedies for the emotions, a major concern of his throughout the *Ethics*. Spinoza lists five remedies, all but the first of which (detachment of inadequately conceived external cause, temporal errors, errors in the number of causes, and errors of order of said causes) are really an expansion on how the first item, knowledge of the emotions, their many and various causes, achieves its remedy. ILG, understanding the emotion to be internally affected from eternity by an ultimately single cause through a definite order, remedies the emotions. Spinoza continues the scholium by indicating how to measure the strength of an emotion: as the respective disparity in our power and that of the external cause of the emotion. It is followed with a brief discussion of what constitutes our power and activity, namely knowledge, adequate ideas. In observing that distress and unhappiness

(*aegritudines et infortunia*; suffering and misfortune) stem from our love of ultimately finite and ephemeral objects about which we are uncertain, Spinoza turns to remark on the effectiveness of ILG as a remedy for the emotions by focusing on an object, God, that is constant, eternal, knowable, universal, communal, and unable to be negated. "If it does not completely destroy them, at least it brings it about that they constitute the least part of the mind." With his summary of the remedy for the emotions and follow up observations complete, Spinoza is finished with this present life, and states that he is now turning to "matters that concern the duration of the mind without respect to the body." This sentence, specifically the idea that the mind can endure without respect to the body, along with a few others to be discussed below, generates one of the problems facing ILG, discussed almost *ad nauseam* in I.B, found again in the typology of I.C, and returned to at the end of this sub-chapter. Before moving on with Spinoza, however, it should be mentioned here that all the qualities of ILG, aside from eternity, have already been proven. It is the highest good, an – if not the – ideal, the source of infinite, ultimate, and true joy and happiness in and through a knowledge of the self and God. In short, it is a if not the cardinal value in his system. None of this hinges on our immortality or eternity of our minds, however. In fact, the eternity of our minds hinges on it.

In the next several propositions Spinoza turns first to discussing several functions of the mind that either cease or continue with the destruction of the body. EVp21 removes the imagination and memory with destruction of the body.[110] EVp22 assures us that God nevertheless never forgets us, or rather our bodied selves, in that God has an idea of each individual body conceived under a form of eternity (*sub specie aeternitatis*), whose essence is caused by the eternal necessity of God's essence.[111] Drawing on the preceding proposition, EVp23 attempts to prove the eternity of the mind

[110] EVp21, *Works*, p. 373.
[111] EVp22, *Works*, p. 374.

over and against the finitude of the body.[112] On closer inspection, the proposition attempts to prove both immortality and the pre-existence of the mind to the body. How exactly this is so is a problem in the scholarship we certainly recall from the literature review above, and will be returned to briefly at the end of this sub-section. Before we move on, however, it should also be noted that Spinoza here effectively expands the concept of life far beyond what we normally conceive it to include. For Spinoza, the eternity of ideas, in themselves, as entailed necessarily by previous and more fundamental ideas, and necessarily effecting later ideas seems to transcend, for lack of a better word, our normal conception of life. In the scholium, Spinoza defers to the fact that "nevertheless, we feel and experience that we are eternal" to shore up his argumentation, perhaps appealing more to our religious sensibilities, but his philosophy supports the idea just the same. Finally, the durational aspect or experiences of the mind are relegated to a place of minor importance in EVp23S. EVp24-31 demonstrate several key things about our minds in relation to its objects: that knowledge of individual things is a knowledge of God;[113] that knowledge of things of the third kind is the highest conatus and virtue;[114] that this knowledge of the third kind is cumulatively self-motivating in its drive for more knowledge of the third kind;[115] that from knowledge of the third kind arises the highest possible contentment (*acquiescentia*) of the mind;[116] that the conatus arises from the second kind of knowledge, reason, and not from the first, imagination;[117] that all eternal knowledge, knowledge *sub specie aeternitatis*, depends on knowledge of the body, knowledge that is itself eternal being knowledge of the essence of the body, and not on knowledge of the present actual durational existence of the

[112] EVp23, *Works*, p. 374.
[113] EVp24, *Works*, p. 374.
[114] EVp25, *Works*, p. 375.
[115] EVp26, *Works*, p. 375.
[116] EVp27, *Works*, p. 375.
[117] EVp28, *Works*, p. 375.

body;[118] that eternal knowledge necessarily entails a knowledge of God, a reflexive knowledge of its dependence on God;[119] and that the third kind of knowledge has the eternal mind as its formal cause.[120]

Among these significant propositions that, *inter alia*, lay out the eternal mechanism of the mind, there are two scholia of note. The scholium to EVp29 divides our knowledge of existence in two, as necessarily eternally determined by and in God or as related to a fixed time and place.[121] The scholium to EVp31 identifies the third kind of knowledge with self-consciousness, the knowledge of God, perfection, and blessedness.[122]

Spinoza returns to ILG for a few propositions in EVp32.

> EVp32: We take pleasure in whatever we understand by the third kind of knowledge, and this is accompanied by the idea of God as cause.
> Demonstration From this kind of knowledge there arises the highest possible contentment of mind (EVp27), that is (Def. of Emotions 25), the highest possible pleasure, and this is accompanied by the idea of oneself, and consequently (EVp30) also by the idea of God, as cause.
> Corollary From the third kind of knowledge there necessarily arises the intellectual love of God [amor Dei intellectualis]. For from this kind of knowledge there arises (preceding Pr.) pleasure accompanied by the idea of God as cause, that is (Def. of Emotions 6), the love of God not insofar as we imagine him as present (EVp29) but insofar as we understand God to be eternal. And this is what I call the intellectual love of God.

This proposition connects the foregoing discussion of the third kind of knowledge to both pleasure in that same intuitive knowledge and the idea of God again as cause in that same intuitive knowledge. The proof draws on the superlative *acquiescentia* of EVp27 and through the mechanism of the emotions identifies *acquiescentia* with the highest possible pleasure. In the corollary, Spinoza identifies all of the above, the superlative *acquiescntia*, pleasure, knowledge of self and of God as

[118] EVp29, *Works*, p. 376.
[119] EVp30, *Works*, p. 376.
[120] EVp31, *Works*, pp. 376-7.
[121] EVp29S, *Works*, p. 376.
[122] EVp31S, *Works*, p. 377.

cause, all of it, with ILG

> EVp33: The intellectual love of God which arises from the third kind of knowledge is eternal.
> Demonstration The third kind of knowledge is eternal (EVp31, and EIA3), and therefore (by the same EIA3) the love that arises from it is also necessarily eternal.
> Scholium: Although this love toward God has had no beginning (preceding Pr.), it yet has all the perfections of love just as if it had originated in the manner we supposed in the Corollary to the preceding Proposition. There is no difference, except that the mind has possessed from eternity those perfections which we then supposed to be accruing to it, accompanied by the idea of God as eternal cause. If pleasure consists in the transition to a state of greater perfection, blessedness must surely consist in this, that the mind is endowed with perfection itself.

Having formally introduced and now proven ILG, Spinoza expands our understanding of it in EVp33, stressing its eternal nature. The proof simply connects the eternity of the ideas in the knowledge generating ILG with their corresponding love. The scholium introduces a development in his string of identifications which includes pleasure and blessedness. Blessedness is here the joy of enjoying one's perfection, not of the transition to a state of greater perfection.

> EVp34: It is only while the body endures that the mind is subject to passive emotions.
> Demonstration: Imagining is the idea whereby the mind regards something as present (see its definition in EIIp17S), an idea which, however, indicates the present state of the body rather than the nature of an external thing (EIIp16C2). Therefore, an emotion (Gen. Def. of Emotions) is an imagining insofar as it indicates the present state of the body. So (EVp21) it is only while the body endures that the mind is subject to passive emotions.
> Corollary: Hence it follows that no love is eternal except for intellectual love [amor intellectualis].
> Scholium: If we turn our attention to the common belief entertained by men, we shall see that they are indeed conscious of the eternity of the mind, but they confuse it with duration and assign it to imagination or to memory, which they believe to continue after death.

Though EVp34 is concerned with connecting passivity to the duration of the body, the corollary informs us that ILG is the only love that is eternal. The scholium simply derides the common beliefs regarding the eternity of the mind and its insistence on maintaining imagination and memory through eternity.

> EVp35: God loves himself with an infinite intellectual love.
> Demonstration: God is absolutely infinite (EID6); that is (EIID6), God's nature enjoys infinite perfection, accompanied (EIIp3) by the idea of itself, that is (EIp11 and EID1), by the idea of its own cause; and that is what, in EVp32C we declared to be intellectual love.

This proposition introduces God's ILG. Since God is absolutely infinite and infinitely perfect so is God's idea of itself, as self-caused, and thus God's corresponding love of self is infinite. It depicts existence brimming with infinite love and joy in its own power and perfection. On one level, then, ILG is all there is. It is the single infinite act of God.

> EVp36: The mind's intellectual love toward God is the love of God wherewith God loves himself not insofar as he is infinite, but insofar as he can be explicated through the essence of the human mind considered under a form of eternity. That is, the mind's intellectual love toward God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself.
> Demonstration: This, the mind's love, must be related to the active nature of the mind (EVp32C and EIIIp3), and is therefore an activity whereby the mind regards itself, accompanied by the idea of God as cause (EVp32 and EVP32C); that is (EIp25C and EIIp11C), an activity whereby God, insofar as he can be explicated through the human mind, regards himself, accompanied by the idea of himself. And therefore (preceding Pr.) this love of God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself.
> Corollary: Hence it follows that God, insofar as he loves himself, loves mankind, and, consequently, that the love of God toward men and the mind's intellectual love toward God are one and the same.
> Scholium: From this we clearly understand in what our salvation or blessedness or freedom consists, namely, in the constant and eternal love toward God, that is, in God's love toward men. This love or blessedness is called glory in the Holy Scriptures, and rightly so. For whether this love be related to God or to the mind, it can properly be called spiritual contentment, which in reality cannot be distinguished from glory (Def. of Emotions 25 and 30). For insofar as it is related to God, it is (EVp35) pleasure (if we may still use this term) accompanied by the idea of himself, and this is also the case insofar as it is related to the mind (EVp27). Again, since the essence of our mind consists solely in knowledge, whose principle and basis is God (EIp15 and EIIp47S), it follows that we see quite clearly how and in what way our mind, in respect of essence and existence, follows from the divine nature and is continuously dependent on God. I have thought this worth noting here in order to show by this example the superiority of that knowledge of particular things which I have called "intuitive" or "of the third kind," and its preferability to that abstract knowledge which I have called "knowledge of the second kind." For although I demonstrated in a general way in Part I that everything (and consequently the human mind, too) is dependent on God in respect of its essence and of its existence, that

> proof, although legitimate and exempt from any shadow of doubt, does not so strike the mind as when it is inferred from the essence of each particular thing which we assert to be dependent on God.

EVp36 is a major proposition in the discussions of ILG. It is the one cited most often, sometimes exclusively, in the scholarly discussions of ILG. In it Spinoza identifies human or modal ILG with divine ILG. Its proof depends on the idea that all modes in their activity are expressing their finite proportion of God's infinite activity. Insofar as modes are and are conceived in substance, their activity, ultimately and truly ILG, just is an expression of God's ILG. The corollary in turn puts forth that God, both in infinitely loving and in the infinite love of the infinite number of finite modes that are both in and conceived through God, loves humankind (and, in fact, all modes). It reaffirms the identity of human and divine ILG. The scholium, again as is usually the case, is Spinoza speaking frankly about ILG. He herein explicitly identifies salvation, blessedness, and freedom with ILG. He even adds the scriptural concept of glory to the string of identities, something we saw earlier to have been shown to be present in if not necessarily drawn from Maimonides. Spinoza indicates that he is aware of how much he is straining his earlier EIII definition of pleasure in his discussions of ILG in EV, and on my reading is here asking for leniency as he develops the concept, something barely picked up in the scholarship. The scholium ends with a preference for the third kind of knowledge, intuition, of singular things, over the second kind of knowledge, reason, an abstract knowledge of things through the common notions.

> EVp37: There is nothing in Nature which is contrary to this intellectual love, or which can destroy it.
> Demonstration: This intellectual love follows necessarily from the nature of the mind insofar as that is considered as an eternal truth through God's nature (EVp 33 and 29). Therefore, if there were anything that was contrary to this love, it would be contrary to truth, and consequently that which could destroy this love could cause truth to be false, which, as is self-evident, is absurd. Therefore, there is nothing in Nature . . . etc.

> Scholium: The Axiom in Part IV is concerned with particular things insofar as they are considered in relation to a definite time and place, of which I think no one can be in doubt.

EVp37, the last proposition explicitly about ILG in this block of propositions, maintains that ILG is so powerful and ubiquitous that nothing is contrary to nor can destroy it. In the proof, ILG, being a true recognition of the eternal necessity of things and their dependence on God, in order to be negated, would have to cease being true, eternal, or necessary. This is impossible, making any kind of negation of ILG itself impossible.

The next few propositions of EV, EVp38-40,[123] all revolve around the idea that as knowledge increases, one's negative emotions, passivity, and fear of death decrease, and our mind is more eternal. EVp41 insists that even eschewing all talk of eternity in the foregoing, what has been said about everything else in the *Ethics*, most especially, I argue, of ILG, remains "of prime importance."[124] This single proposition, and its scholium which derides the common run of conceptions of eternity, immortality, and the like, specifically for the hope and fear, the vacillations of the mind and heart, the passivity, that they induce, would seem to undermine the amount of effort put in to correcting Spinoza's concept of the eternity of the mind in the scholarship. For, almost none of the ethics of the *Ethics* depends on it.

Finally, though not usually included in the set of propositions demonstrating ILG, there is EVp42, the final proposition of the *Ethics*:

> EVp42: Blessedness is not the reward of virtue, but virtue itself. We do not enjoy blessedness because we keep our lusts in check. On the contrary, it is because we enjoy blessedness that we are able to keep our lusts in check.
> Demonstration: Blessedness consists in love toward God (EVp36 and p36S), a love that arises from the third kind of knowledge (EVp32C), and so this love (EIIIp 9 and 3) must be related to the mind insofar as the mind is active; and therefore it is virtue itself (EIVD8). That is the first point. Again, the more the mind enjoys this

[123] EVp38-40, *Works*, pp. 379-381.
[124] EVp41, *Works*, pp. 381-2.

> divine love or blessedness, the more it understands (EVp32); that is (EVp3C), the more power it has over the emotions and (EVp38) the less subject it is to emotions that are bad. So the mind's enjoyment of this divine love or blessedness gives it the power to check lusts. And since human power to keep lusts in check consists solely in the intellect, nobody enjoys blessedness because he has kept his emotions in check. On the contrary, the power to keep lusts in check arises from blessedness itself.
> Scholium: I have now completed all that I intended to demonstrate concerning the power of the mind over the emotions and concerning the freedom of the mind. This makes clear how strong the wise man is and how much he surpasses the ignorant man whose motive force is only lust. The ignorant man, besides being driven hither and thither by external causes, never possessing true contentment of spirit, lives as if he were unconscious of himself, God, and things, and as soon as he ceases to be passive, he at once ceases to be at all . On the other hand, the wise man, insofar as he is considered as such, suffers scarcely any disturbance of spirit, but being conscious, by virtue of a certain eternal necessity, of himself, of God and of things, never ceases to be, but always possesses true spiritual contentment.
>
> If the road I have pointed out as leading to this goal seems very difficult, yet it can be found. Indeed, what is so rarely discovered is bound to be hard. For if salvation were ready to hand and could be discovered without great toil, how could it be that it is almost universally neglected? All things excellent are as difficult as they are rare.

With this closing proposition to the *Ethics*, Spinoza offers us plenty. The proposition defines blessedness, not as the reward of virtue, but as virtue itself. It identifies blessedness, a distinctly religious term, with virtue, and in turn ethics and the good generally. It follows in asserting that blessedness is the cause of our self-control and restraint. His use of the term "lusts" (*libidines*) here indicates he is referring to our various erroneous projections of love, our inadequately conceived loves. In short, all loves aside from ILG. The proof for the first clause connects blessedness to activity and thus virtue through ILG. Our virtue depends on our efficaciousness, our activity, itself dependent on our knowledge of the causes of our activity, which, when adequately understood is ILG. The proof for the second and third clauses draws on the fact that blessedness is ILG which itself is an increase in our knowledge, power, joy, and happiness, and that it is only as a result of this increase in power that we "keep our lusts in check," or "remedy the emotions." In the scholium to this final proposition and in consciously concluding the work, Spinoza offers us a few keen

observations about the nature of the wise and ignorant. Curiously he contends that the ignorant are as a result so passive with regards to the many external causes of their actions that were they to become aware and thus active this change would be so great as to constitute death. This evidences an exceptionally fine limitation to Spinoza's concept of identity that at the other end encompasses all of finite existence and even things at different times and places. The wise, "being conscious, by virtue of a certain eternal necessity, of [herself], of God and of things," themselves all eternally necessary, is herself never ceasing to be or be content, if proportionally so. In the last paragraph, besides offering us a line to be used for centuries by scholars of Spinoza in their various monographs, Spinoza offers us nothing short of salvation, another significant religious term, in ILG and the road to it that is the *Ethics*. It is as difficult as it is rare, but it is excellent.

In brief, in the *Ethics* ILG has all the qualities we've come to expect from the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition, and from Spinoza's earlier works. Most importantly for our present purposes is to highlight the fact that, once again, ILG is the telos or good of human existence, the source and standard of all value, the ethical and social ideal, necessary for and consists of union or some kind of identity with God, grounded in knowledge of God and existence, and the cause of immortality or the eternity of the mind.

III.E.ii. The Problems with the Intellectual love of God, Revisited.

The concept of ILG, as presented above, is found exclusively in the final part, Part V, of the *Ethics*, and even in the latter half of EV, right at the end of the whole work.[125] Due to the reigning prioritization of earlier concepts, propositions, axioms, and definitions of the *Ethics* in the

[125] The only references to ILG outside of Part V are: EII Pref., EIIP49S, EIVP28, EIVP36, EIVP52S, and EIV App. Even then, some of the instances are the expression of the intention to discuss ILG or refer to it by one of its many other terms, such as highest good or highest virtue.

scholarship, ILG's late appearance has, among other factors, caused it to be taken as subsidiary to those same previously prioritized aspects. This has resulted in a long history of confusion in its interpretation, discussed earlier throughout Chapter I. As we turn again to the problems facing ILG, however, the structure of the *Ethics* and its geometric method necessitate at least some knowledge of the ideas and concepts contained in the propositions, axioms, and definitions that come before and which help populate the system within which we find ILG before adequately understanding ILG itself, let alone attempting to engage the problems facing ILG in the *Ethics*. In my commentary on the propositions demonstrating ILG I purposefully tried to minimize the dependence of the explanation on earlier propositions, axioms, and definitions. Therefore, as a result of ILG's highly developed and composite location and nature, as well as the full-fledged treatment given to the component concepts of ILG throughout the *Ethics*, my adequately presenting the role and function of ILG throughout the *Ethics*, not just at the end as argued for and presented above, as well as my being able to adequately engage the problems facing ILG, requires some background. In order to better our understanding of the concept of ILG in the *Ethics* and as cardinal for Spinoza, I now turn to three major dimensions of Spinoza's philosophy.[126] The first will treat of Spinoza's metaphysics. The second will treat of Spinoza's epistemology. The third will treat of Spinoza's theory of the affects. Each sub-section will survey the respective dimension of Spinoza's philosophy, presenting its key concepts and propositions, focusing on those particularly relevant for our understanding of ILG and the problems facing it.

III.E.ii.a. The Metaphysics of the Intellectual Love of God.

In order to better understand how ILG operates for Spinoza, and specifically in its metaphysical or ontological dimension, we turn to Spinoza's metaphysics, primarily as presented in

[126] This tri-partite division seems to echo and is informed by the tri-partite format of what scholars take to be early drafts of the *Ethics*.

Part I of his *Ethics*. Focusing on Spinoza's concepts of Substance and Modes, the following errs on the side of exhaustiveness for the benefit of the dissertation at large, and not just this sub-section. After all, "the antithesis of substance and modes," "central to Spinoza's metaphysics [as] evident from the first axiom of the *Ethics*, which divides reality into substances and modes"[127] does play an enormous role in ILG, being the agents and objects, the who's and the what's, of ILG.

Spinoza defines and geometrically demonstrates the properties of his concept of Substance in Part I, "On God," of his *Ethics*. Spinoza's definitions of substance, attribute, and mode – key elements of his metaphysics – items three through five on his list of definitions beginning Part I, are presented below:

> 3. By substance I mean that which is in itself and is conceived through itself; that is, that the conception of which does not require the conception of another thing from which it has to be formed.
> 4. By attribute I mean that which the intellect perceives of substance as constituting its essence.
> 5. By mode I mean the affections of substance, that is, that which is in something else and is conceived through something else.[128]

Spinoza immediately follows these definitions with one of God:

> 6. By God I mean an absolutely infinite being, that is, substance consisting of infinite attributes, each of which expresses eternal and infinite essence.
> Explication: I say "absolutely infinite," not "infinite in its kind." For if a thing is only infinite in its kind, one may deny that it has infinite attributes. But if a thing is absolutely infinite, whatever expresses essence and does not involve any negation belongs to its essence.[129]

Notice that Spinoza, already in D6, subtly identifies God with substance. Specifically, God is a "substance consisting of infinite attributes, each of which expresses eternal and infinite essence," and each of which is understood "as constituting [substance's] essence." Notice also the explication of the difference between infinite and absolutely infinite, a key distinction for Spinoza and for later

[127] Curley (1969), p. 3.
[128] EI Definitions, *Works*, p. 217.
[129] EI Definitions, *Works*, p. 217.

discussions. Infinite in its kind, the infinity of the attributes, is mere infinity of a sort, complete but of a kind, and thus limited and not absolute. Absolutely infinite, the infinity of God or Substance, on the other hand, is an all-encompassing, totalizing infinite that unites the various mere infinities of the attributes, later demonstrated to be technically infinite in number.

In the first fourteen propositions of Part I of the *Ethics*, based off of his initial Definitions and Axioms, Spinoza reinforces the identity of God and Substance by arguing that his philosophical concept of substance warrants most of the properties of a God traditionally and philosophically understood:[130] priority,[131] uniqueness,[132] existence,[133] existential independence or self-causation,[134] infinity,[135] necessity,[136] and indivisibility.[137]

EIp15-18 discuss God's causal relations, how "infinite things in infinite ways," or "everything that can come within the scope of the infinite intellect," including their very conceivability,[138] "follow" from, or, what's the same, are caused by God.[139] Things that follow from or are caused by God are also said to be "produced" by God,[140] or that God has "determined" them.[141] Thus, God is the absolute first,[142] efficient,[143] and immanent cause of all things,[144] acting, or

---

130 As indicated in the literature review, Wolfson (1934) is an excellent starting point into the connection between Spinoza's philosophy and traditional monotheistic theological metaphysics. Cf. Vol I, Chs. 3-12, with several subchapters dedicated to the proceeding listed properties, for discussions contextualizing Spinoza's concept of Substance and Mode, God, and the Attributes, within the interdependent Western monotheistic traditions. Mason (1997), "the fullest study in English for many years on the role of God in Spinoza's philosophy" (p. i), treats of this connection but exclusively with regards to Spinoza's concept of God especially in Part II, pp. 117-186.
131 EIp1, *Works*, p. 218. Also, EIp16c3, *Works*, p. 227.
132 EIp2-6, *Works*, p. 219. Also, EIp14, EIp14c1, *Works*, p. 224.
133 EIp7, *Works*, p. 219.
134 EIp6c, EIp7, *Works*, p. 219.
135 EIp8, *Works*, p. 219.
136 EIp11, *Works*, p. 222. Cf. Marion's "The Coherence of Spinoza's Definitions of God in *Ethics* I, Proposition 11" (1991) and Garret's "Spinoza's 'Ontological' Argument" (1979) for just two works analyzing the various arguments put forth in this proposition for God's necessary existence.
137 EIp12, 13, *Works*, p. 223-4. Also, EIp15s, *Works*, p. 225-6.
138 EIp15, *Works*, p. 225.
139 EIp16, *Works*, p. 227. For God as the cause of things in him, EIp18D.
140 EIp24, *Works*, p. 232.
141 EIp26, *Works*, p. 232.
142 EIp16c3, *Works*, p. 227.
143 EIp16c1, *Works*, p. 227.

causing,[145] "solely from the laws of his own nature,"[146] "through himself, not *per accidens*,"[147] making God eternally and actually omnipotent.[148]

EIp19 marks a bit of a transition point in Part I. From here on Spinoza begins to speak of things directly and indirectly caused by God, and what properties they have vis-à-vis God. Thus, insofar as God is necessary and exists, God is eternal, and so are all the attributes.[149] They are, again like God, also immutable.[150] Modes "which follow from the absolute nature of any attribute of God,"[151] or as "modified by a modification that exists necessarily and as infinite through that same attribute"[152] are also necessary, eternal, and infinite.[153] This last point, drawing on EIp21-23, propositions which demonstrate the infinite modes, also establishes the transitivity of Substance's properties of necessity, eternity, and infinity to all things directly caused by it through one of its attributes, themselves necessary, eternal, and infinite insofar as they express God's essence. For God, essence and existence are one and the same.[154] However, while the essences of things produced by God do not involve existence,[155] God is the efficient cause of both their essences and their existence,[156] making God the cause of the being of things, both inter and extra-mentally, in thought and extension (and, assumedly, in every other attribute). God's causal determination encompasses all causal determination.[157] No mode can determine itself to act,[158] nor can it

---

144 EIp18, *Works*, p. 229.
145 To be is to be a cause. Cf. EIp36, "Nothing exists from whose nature an effect does not follow," *Works*, p. 238.
146 EIp17, *Works*, p. 227.
147 EIp16c2, *Works*, p. 227.
148 EIp17s, *Works*, p. 228.
149 EIp19, *Works*, p. 230.
150 EIp20c2, *Works*, p. 230.
151 EIp21, *Works*, p. 230.
152 EIp22, *Works*, p. 231.
153 EIp21-23, *Works*, p. 230-1.
154 EIp20, *Works*, p. 230.
155 EIp24, *Works*, p. 232.
156 EIp25, *Works*, p. 232.
157 EIp26, *Works*, p. 232.
158 EIp26, *Works*, p. 232.

undetermine itself.[159] Strict radical determinism defines Spinoza's system. Thus, Spinoza asserts that "nothing in nature is contingent, but all things are from the necessity of the divine nature determined to exist and to act in a definite way."[160] Spinoza is even sure to include the will within the purview of his radical determinism, as the will, be it finite or infinite, is also necessarily caused and determined,[161] giving the will a different and often equivocal or esoteric meaning for Spinoza. Finite modes, or "particular things [,] are nothing but affections of the attributes of God, that is, modes wherein the attributes of God find expression in a definite and determinate way,"[162] being determined by prior finite modes, ad infinitum.[163] An infinite regress of causally dependent finite particular things or modes also defines Spinoza's system. This infinite causal network is composed solely of the attributes and affections of God, the only things comprehended by either the finite intellect or the infinite intellect,[164] and "could not have been produced by God in any other way or in any other order than is the case."[165] Thus, strict necessitarianism holds for Spinoza's system of radical determinism. God's power is identified with God's essence,[166] creating a string of equivalencies for Spinoza between God's essence, existence, and power, in that they each and all signify substance, which is necessary, infinite, eternal, and self-caused. To this string of equivalencies, we can add reality, being, and freedom. This is insofar as if "the more reality or being a thing has, the more attributes it has,"[167] and God has infinite attributes, then God has infinite reality or being. And, freedom, defined as "existing solely from the necessity of its nature,"[168] is,

---

[159] EIp27, *Works*, p. 233.
[160] EIp29, *Works*, p. 234.
[161] EIp32, *Works*, p. 235. This understanding of the will completely undermines the traditional understanding of the will as free, uncaused, as the locus of choice and decision, and essentially identifies it with the intellect, or the mind.
[162] EIp25c, *Works*, p.232.
[163] EIp28, *Works*, p. 233.
[164] EIp30, *Works*, p. 234.
[165] EIp33, *Works*, p. 235.
[166] EIp34, *Works*, p. 238.
[167] EIp9, *Works*, p. 221.
[168] EId7, *Works*, p. 217.

properly speaking, exclusively a property of God. For God, and only God, exists solely from the necessity of its own nature, which is infinite and necessary, making "God alone […] a free cause."[169] Thus God's essence, existence, power, reality, being, and freedom are all identical numerically, identically infinite, eternal, necessary, and self-caused. All of which is also found to be an eternal truth.[170] Finally, God is proved to be omnipotent. This is since nothing exists without causing an effect,[171] and God's power, recently identified with God's absolutely infinite essence, [172] and thus with God's existence, reality, being, freedom, causes absolutely infinite effects, all of which exist necessarily,[173] i.e. omnipotence.

This is an admittedly brief and dense presentation of the majority of the propositions and many of the concepts presented in Part I of the *Ethics*. Following from strict philosophical definitions and axioms, it describes a vision of absolutely infinite power, of which everything is but a part of. This power is unique, self-sufficient and expresses itself eternally, necessarily, and infinitely. Everything, being but a part of this absolutely infinite power, is necessarily determined by it and within it from eternity. Existence is but an unfolding of the necessity of the infinite.

III.E.ii.b. The Epistemology of the Intellectual Love of God.

The following sub-section will discuss Spinoza's epistemology. This is to better understand how ILG operates for Spinoza in its epistemological or intellectual dimension, the "intellect" in the *Intellectual* Love of God. It will allow us to better engage what is without a doubt one of the greatest obstacles to a coherent understanding of Spinoza's concept of ILG, if not his philosophy as a whole, Spinoza's concept of immortality or the eternity of the mind – consequences of ILG that have

[169] EIp17c2, *Works*, p. 228.
[170] EIp20c2, *Works*, p. 230.
[171] EIp36, *Works*, p. 238.
[172] EIp34, *Works*, p. 238.
[173] EIp35, *Works*, p. 238.

frustrated scholars to no end.

Spinoza begins to develop his epistemology in EII, "On the Nature and Origin of the Mind," to "lead us as it were by the hand to the knowledge of the human mind and its utmost *blessedness*."[174] Thus, already in the Preface to EII, Spinoza explicitly declares his conception of the human mind which follows to be designed, that is, geometrically presented and demonstrated, in order to direct us to blessedness, i.e. ILG. In developing his understanding of the human being, as but one entirely non-unique[175] finite mode among the infinite number of finite modes of substance, Spinoza establishes the parallelism of the attributes (EIIp7),[176] which is fundamental for understanding the relationship between the (human) mind and body, and their relationship to God, the explanation of which reaches its zenith in ILG. The attributes, of which there are an infinite number of, each express God's infinite essence and necessarily exist.[177] They are what are understood of substance as constituting its essence.[178] Thought[179] and Extension[180] are the only two we know. All modes of any single attribute have God as their cause only as understood in and through that attribute.[181] Thus, the attributes are causally independent of each other. Ideas cause ideas. Bodies effect bodies. However, nothing happens in the body which the mind does not also perceive,[182] for the mind is but the idea of the body.[183] But that is enough about the attributes for now.

---

[174] EII Preface, *Works*, p. 243 (emphasis mine).
[175] By this I simply mean that the human being is, for Spinoza, as all finite modes are, the result of and following from the same necessary laws of nature, and is not exempt from them or under the jurisdiction of any other laws. Humankind is not a "kingdom within a kingdom." As Spinoza says, he "treats of human actions and appetites just as if it were an investigation into lines, planes, or bodies" (EIII Preface, *Works*, p. 278).
[176] "The order and connection of ideas is the same as the order and connection of things," EIIp7, *Works*, 247.
[177] EIp11, *Works*, p 222.
[178] EID4, *Works*, p. 217.
[179] EIIp1, *Works*, p. 245
[180] EIIp2, *Works*, p. 245.
[181] EIIp6, *Works*, p. 246/7.
[182] EIIp12, *Works*, p. 251
[183] EIIp13, *Works*, p. 251.

Spinoza offers us a brief physical digression in EIIp13, expanding on the physics of motion and rest in his system. We also have several propositions devoted to an "analysis of error,"[184] delineating the difference between adequate and true vs inadequate and false ideas (EIIp19-35). Conveniently for our purposes, towards the end of Part II, Spinoza neatly summarizes his epistemology in EIIp40S2:

> From all that has already been said it is quite clear that we perceive many things and form universal notions:
>
> 1. From individual objects presented to us through the senses in a fragmentary (mutilate) and confused manner without any intellectual order (see Cor. Pr. 29, II); and therefore I call such perceptions "knowledge from casual experience."
>
> 2 . From symbols. For example, from having heard or read certain words we call things to mind and we form certain ideas of them similar to those through which we imagine things (Sch. Pc. 1 8, II).
>
> Both these ways of regarding things I shall in future refer to as "knowledge of the first kind;' "opinion," or "imagination."
>
> 3 . From the fact that we have common notions and adequate ideas of the properties of things (see Cor. Pro 38 and 39 with its Cor., and Pro 40, II). I shall refer to this as "reason" and "knowledge of the second kind."
>
> Apart from these two kinds of knowledge there is, as I shall later show, a third kind of knowledge, which I shall refer to as "intuition." This kind of knowledge proceeds from an adequate idea of the formal essence of certain attributes of God to an adequate knowledge of the essence of things…[185]

As we can see from the above scholium, Spinoza presents three ways, or kinds, of perceiving: imagination (which includes items knowledge from causal experience and symbols), reason, and intuition. These three ways of "perceiving"[186] together compose the whole spectrum of knowledge, ranging from inadequate or false ideas, i.e. ideas of the imagination (EIIp41), to adequate or true ideas, i.e. ideas of reason and intuition (EIIp42).

For Spinoza falsity is understood to consist in the privation, or lack, of correspondence of an

---

[184] EIIp17s, *Works*, p. 257.
[185] *Works*, p. 267.
[186] Cf. EIID3 where Spinoza, though oddly not particularly consistent on this question of terminology in the work, distinguishes the passive "perception" [*perceptionis*] from the active "conception" [*conceptus*].

idea with its object (EIIp35).[187] For, "a true idea must agree with that of which it is the idea."[188] Thus, even inadequate / imagined ideas, insofar as they can be said to contain anything positive or coherent, are true or real (EIIp33). They possess and follow the same necessity as adequate ideas (EIIp36), and "looked at in themselves, [imagined ideas] contain no error; i.e., the mind does not err from the fact that it imagines, but only insofar as it is considered to lack the idea which excludes the existence of those things which it imagines to be present to itself (EIIp17s)."[189] In other words, imagined ideas, though caused or arising in our minds necessarily, are woefully incomplete. Moreover, it is this incomplete correspondence between the idea and its object that confuses or fragments (to use Spinoza's terms), or otherwise precludes, an adequate understanding of or correspondence of the idea with its object. In turn, an adequate or true idea, be it attained through reason or intuition, "means only to know a thing perfectly, that is, to the utmost *degree*,"[190] and with certainty.[191] As a consequence of Spinoza's radical determinism this further means to regard a thing as necessary (EIIp44), as absolutely causally determined. For, "the knowledge of an effect depends on, and involves, the knowledge of the cause."[192] Thus, the question of the truth or adequacy of an idea is ultimately one of the degree to which it soundly affirms the absolute and necessary causal determination of the mode, be it understood as an idea or a body, by God. To put it differently, on my reading, truth or adequacy is the degree to which an idea precludes a contingent understanding of the mode. A complete understanding of the entire infinite causal matrix by which any single finite mode has been absolutely and necessarily determined is had only by God in the idea of the infinite intellect. However, as Spinoza understands it, an adequate degree of the absolute and necessary

[187] EIIp43S, "If a true idea is distinguished from a false one only inasmuch as it is said to correspond with that of which it is an idea, then a true idea has no more reality or perfection than a false one (since they are distinguished only by an extrinsic characteristic)…"
[188] EIAx6, *Works*, p. 218.
[189] *Works*, p. 257.
[190] EIIp43s, *Works*, p. 269 [emphasis mine].
[191] Curley (1969), p. 27, discusses imagination as not false but uncertain.
[192] EIAx4, *Works*, p. 218.

determination of any and all finite modes by God can be achieved through both the second and third kinds of knowledge, namely, reason and intuition.[193] Therefore, in EIIp44, Spinoza notes that it is of the nature of the imagination to "regard things… as contingent," and of the nature of reason (and also the intuition) to regard things as necessary, that is to "perceive things under a species of eternity,"[194] a species of God's necessary and eternal nature.[195]

The proposition above, EIIp44, is, I find, the first occurrence in the *Ethics* of the phrase, familiar to us from his later discussion of ILG in EV, "species of eternity" (*sub quadam aeternitatis specie*). From the context, it is here asserting that the eternity of certain ideas of our minds, ideas of reason and intuition, is a version or type, a [*specie*] of God's necessary and eternal nature. What precisely he means here by "eternity," though technically defined earlier (EID8), let alone a "species of" it, will be taken up again later in the *Ethics*, especially in the latter half of EV, in the propositions discussing ILG.

Moving on from questions of adequacy and necessity, and drawing on the fact that to know something is simply to know its causes, Spinoza then points out that ideas of actually existing[196] things thus involve the eternal and infinite essence of God.[197] For, by EID6, an idea of the attribute through which the actually existing thing is caused by and understood through itself expresses the eternal and infinite essence of God. This knowledge of the attribute within which we find and through which we understand the mode is adequate[198] and shared by all.[199] In fact, this knowledge of

---

[193] This is actually just a rephrasing of the PSR, that all things are in principle knowable.
[194] EIIp44c1, c2, *Works*, p. 269-70.
[195] "This necessity is the very necessity of God's eternal nature. Therefore it is in the nature of reason to regard things under this species of eternity," EIIp44c2, *Works*, p. 270.
[196] The expressions "actually existing" or "existing in actuality" may be misleading insofar as by it Spinoza simply means the existence of something "as they are in God." Since God has an idea of every possible thing that can fall under an infinite intellect, "actually existing" simply denotes all things that are logically possible when considered in themselves. The expression entails no reference to the so called durational or quantitative existence of the thing. Cf., EIIp45s.
[197] EIIp45, *Works*, p. 270/1.
[198] EIIp46, *Works*, p. 271.
[199] EIIp47, *Works*, p. 271.

the attributes, and thus of God's eternal and infinite essence, is the basis for all knowledge.[200] Further, it is from this adequate knowledge of the eternal and infinite essence of God that we can "deduce a great many things so as to know them adequately and thus to form that third kind of knowledge [intuition]"[201] – something to be taken up in EV.

Though reason and intuition are both adequate, they operate differently both from each other and especially from the imagination. Reason, drawing on the ideas of the imagination, forms common notions, absolutely universal properties of things derived directly from sense data and experience. These common notions allow the mind to, not abstract, but generalize to higher and higher properties of being. Intuition, drawing on the inferences and conclusions of reason, captures much the same content of reason, but does so immediately, non-discursively, and all at once. In that immediate knowledge it understands finite modes as being caused necessarily and directly by God. It is here that the mystical reading of Spinoza, though wrong, gets its motivation. The ideas we have via the intuition are, according to Spinoza, very few, and, by EVp42, are thus as difficult to attain as they are rare.

It strengthens the argument of the dissertation to note here that Spinoza ends EII with a short list of four "practical advantages"[202] to his philosophy. Two of which we are supposed to be able to garner thus far: 1) It teaches that we share in the divine nature and act according to God's will,[203] how to attain tranquility of mind, and "wherein lies our greatest happiness or blessedness, namely, in the knowledge of God alone;[204] and 2) it teaches the proper attitude we should adopt

---

[200] EIIp45, *Works*, p. 270/1.
[201] EIIp47s, *Works*, p. 271.
[202] EIIp49s, *Works*, p. 276.
[203] Spinoza, in EIIp49 (*Works*, p. 272-3), identifies the will with the intellect (EIIp49c), by arguing that volitions, affirmations and negations, are just properties of ideas and the intellect, and not of some separate faculty or kind of knowledge termed 'the will'.
[204] From this knowledge of God, Spinoza immediately continues, "we are induced only to such actions as are urged on us by love and piety (EIIp49s, p. 276)." In other words, and in light of the fact that happiness and blessedness,

towards events beyond our power, namely, "to expect and endure with patience both faces of fortune. For all things follow from God's eternal decree by the same necessity." It also provides us with "advantages" to be developed and discussed later in the *Ethics*, though grounded in what has already been said in EII: 3) certain social maxims that will assist in our "social relations," mostly in EIII; and 4) how to govern, assumedly EIV, perhaps parts of EV as well. Notice also that the first practical advantage lists four things, which, upon further analysis, is not a listing mistake. Rather, they are all identical or at least strongly interrelated, though how this is so is only apparent to someone that has read through the entirety of the *Ethics*. It is by the fact that we are absolutely and necessarily determined by God that we act according to God's will and that we share in the divine nature, and vice versa. It is by recognizing this, that is, by knowing God, his nature and will, and us humans as sharing[205] in it, that we understand "wherein lies our greatest happiness or blessedness," itself tantamount to the tranquility of mind. This is no small claim tucked in at the end of the long scholium to EIIp49 that ends EII.[206] There is plenty to unpack here (and, in fact, one could argue, that, in a certain sense, this is exactly what Spinoza does in the rest of the *Ethics*), but it is a claim that echoes the main argument of the present dissertation and bears repeating: that adequate knowledge of God, humans and other finite modes, and the absolutely and necessarily determinate relationship between the two, as substance and affections or modes of substance, mediated through the attributes which express God's infinite and eternal essence, necessarily and even exclusively gives rise to happiness and blessedness, tranquility of mind, i.e. ILG (!). What's more, this knowledge is the basis for a good society and good government. Thus, by the end of EII, we find Spinoza implicitly or indirectly asserting ILG, to the degree that he can having yet to discuss the emotions

---

themselves synonyms (EVp42), are the result of and synonyms for ILG, we should already understand the basic nature and mechanism of ILG, and its advantages.

[205] Or, better said, being determined by it.

[206] Spinoza actually foreshadows this in the brief Preface to EII, wherein he states that EII will discuss "the knowledge of the human mind and its utmost blessedness" (*Works*, p. 243), namely ILG.

and more specifically the affect of Love, as a if not the cardinal concept and value of his system, upon which all knowledge, happiness, blessedness, and tranquility of mind depend and lead to.

III.E.ii.c. The Affect of the Intellectual Love of God.

In order to better understand how ILG operates for Spinoza in its affective or emotional dimension, the "love" in the Intellectual *Love* of God, this sub-section will discuss Spinoza's theory of the emotions, or affects [*affectus*]. Spinoza's theory of the affects is initially presented in Part III of the *Ethics*, "On the Origin and Nature of the Affects," wherein he defines a wide range of emotions upon discussing the basic mechanism and structure of the affects. In Parts IV and V of the *Ethics*, "On Human Bondage, or the Powers of the Affects" and "On the Power of the Intellect, or on Human Freedom," respectively, Spinoza expands on his theory of the affects. In Part IV, Spinoza discusses the many pitfalls of the affective life, our servitude to our emotions. In Part V, the freedom from them which reason and intuition provide is demonstrated. Focusing on the mechanism and structure of the affects, their relation to the mind, as well as several fundamental emotions, will allow us to better engage the problems facing ILG.

Having demonstrated sufficient details about finite modes, and specifically the human being, for his immediate purposes by the end of Part II, Spinoza turns to the emotions, or affects, in Part III. Spinoza begins Part III, however, by defining a couple of dichotomies that play a vital role in his system. This first is that of adequate and inadequate causes. Parallel to the idea of adequate and inadequate ideas discussed earlier, a cause is considered to be adequate "if the effect can be clearly and distinctly perceived through the cause," and a cause is considered partial or inadequate if it is insufficient for understanding the effect.[207] Mapped directly onto this dichotomy is Spinoza's dichotomy of activity and passivity. Thus, if we, or any finite mode for that matter, are the adequate

[207] EIIID1, *Works*, p. 278.

cause of some effect, if the effect can be understood adequately solely from our own nature, then we are to be considered active with regards to causing the effect. However, in instances in which our natures are inadequate for understanding some effect, be it within us or outside us, if the effect cannot be understood adequately solely from our own nature, we are passive with regards to causing the effect.[208] Our causal or explanatory adequacy with regards to our experiences generally is increased, decreased, or remains neutral, by and through our emotions, affective responses to the experiences of these affections.[209] "Thus, if we can be the adequate cause of one of these affections, then by emotion I understand activity, otherwise passivity [or passion]."[210]

By identifying the mind's activity or passivity, pleasure or pain, a fundamental dichotomy of his system, with the adequacy or inadequacy of its ideas,[211] the human mind is said to be active in the effect of its idea when the idea is adequately understood, that is, its causes are known. Building on the idea that "no thing can be destroyed except by an external cause,"[212] Spinoza then argues for his theory of the conatus (EIIIp6-9).[213] A particular "striving to persevere" that defines and motivates each and every mode, the conatus "is nothing but the actual essence of the thing itself," and, considered in itself, involves no finite or definite period of time, only indefinite time. As the conatus' striving is bolstered or hindered by its various ideas under the attribute of thought, or, what is the same, bolstered or hindered by the body's corresponding various physical interactions under the attribute of extension, the whole range of human emotions arises, and it is to this that much of the rest of Part III is dedicated to.

In turning to the emotions, Spinoza finds it necessary to reaffirm the parallelism of the

---

[208] EIIID2, *Works*, p. 278.
[209] EIIID3, EIII Postulate 1, *Works*, p. 278.
[210] EIIID3, *Works*, p. 278.
[211] EIIIp1, 3, *Works*, pp. 278-9.
[212] EIIIp4, *Works*, p 280.
[213] EIIIp6-9, *Works*, pp. 283-4.

attributes.[214] Placing the human mind under the attribute of thought and the human body under the attribute of extension, Spinoza insists on the causal independence of the attributes, and thus of the human body from the human mind. "The body cannot determine the mind to think, nor can the mind determine the body to motion or rest, or to anything else (if there is anything else)."[215] As a result, the life of the mind, though running parallel to the interactions of the body, must be defined and discussed solely within and through the attribute of thought, just as the interactions of the body must be defined and discussed solely within and through the attribute of extension.

Much of the following propositions in EIII illustrate the mechanism of the emotions by discussing the passions, inadequate ideas of the affections of the body, and how they affect our powers of acting in certain circumstances. Thus, EIIIp12-13 demonstrate that those things imagined to either increase or decrease our powers of acting are as a result sought after or avoided, respectively. EIIIp14-17 demonstrate the various permutations of being affected by two things at once. If we are once affected by two things simultaneously, then when confronted with one at a later time, we will respond as though both are present,[216] especially since our emotion is the same whether the object of our imagination is deemed to be past, present or future.[217] If our emotional response is varied with regards these two things, then when later confronted with the one, we will be equally confused.[218] EIIIp19-27 demonstrate our emotional responses to imagining either a positive thing or negative thing effecting something we love or hate – two terms essential for our purposes and defined in EIIIp13s as pleasure or pain accompanied by the idea of an external cause.[219] EIIIp28 and on discuss how our constant striving for pleasure responds to various things experienced both by us

[214] EIIIp2, *Works*, p. 279.
[215] EIIIp2, *Works*, p. 279.
[216] EIIIp14, *Works*, p. 286.
[217] EIIIp18, *Works*, p.288.
[218] EIIIp17, *Works*, p. 287
[219] EIIIp13S, *Works*, p. 286.

and by the causes of our pleasures and pains.

Without getting too bogged down in the heady details of Spinoza's fairly developed theory of the emotions, and to summarize, the basic mechanism of the emotions is ultimately deceptively simple. There are two fundamental emotions, pleasure and pain. Pleasure is the affective correlate to an increase in our power, to our conatus' striving being bolstered. Pain is the affective correlate to a decrease in our power, to our conatus' striving being hindered. We love what brings us pleasure. We hate what brings us pain. One emotion can be replaced only by another emotion of greater strength. Moreover, it should be noted, that the mind has as many emotions as it has ideas, and that it has a lot of ideas. Insofar as each and every body is the physical correlate under the attribute of extension of a corresponding mind under the attribute of thought, and our bodies are composed of a great many bodies, then our minds are in fact composed of a great many ideas, and a great many emotions, the vast majority of which are confused and inadequate, if we are aware of them at all.

There is obviously much more in EIII, let alone EIV, where Spinoza's concept of human freedom and the power of the mind over the emotions is developed. For our present purposes, however, the above will have to suffice. The basic components of the Affect of ILG have been explained. We now turn to the problems facing ILG in the *Ethics*.

The Problem of Transition:

The problem of transition along with its derivative problem of passivity, occasionally even engaged under the idea of externality, as typologized earlier in I.C., are related. Insofar as a key component of pleasure is a transition "from a state of less perfection to a state of greater perfection"[220] and a key component of love is the "idea of an external cause,"[221] and both are

[220] EIIIDE2, *Works*, p. 311.
[221] EIIIDE6, *Works*, p. 312

constitutive of ILG and absurd for God, we have a problem.

Upon closer inspection, however, we find that Spinoza both is aware of this problem and offers us the tools for a solution. In denying pleasure and passivity to God Spinoza is keen to use the phrase "strictly speaking"[222] (*proprie loquendo*) indicating that based on his earlier definition of pleasure, one depending on a transition to a greater power, God certainly does not experience such a joy. However, Spinoza offers us other pleasures, species of joy, if you will, that can be ascribed to God, and in fact are. These include such concepts as self-contentment (*acquiescentia, acquiescentia in se ipso*), gladness, even glory, joys that do not depend on a transition to greater power and perfection, or on the idea of an external cause, but are joys of maintaining power, of enjoyment of one's power. In discussing God's ILG in EVp32C and EVp35, Spinoza is sure to skip the term "external," modifying the definition of pleasure being used for ILG to indicate the idea of cause more generally. There is little reason not to allow Spinoza this expansion of the term. The problems of transition and passivity have a solution ready at hand, if only readers were willing to shift their interpretative priorities away from those propositions that merely come earlier. While some readers have done so, that this remains a "problem" for some is surprising if approached from a position which takes ILG as cardinal. ILG is a joy, a superlative joy. It is a species of joy that indicates no transition, no externality, and no passivity.

The Problem of Reciprocity:

EVP19, "He who loves God cannot endeavour that God should love him in return," is not only theologically unsettling, but seems to contradict EVP36 wherein we find out that "the mind's intellectual love toward God is the love of God wherewith God loves himself… That is, the mind's

[222] EVp17C, *Works*, p. 371.

intellectual love toward God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself." Thus, our love of God is somehow not reciprocated despite our being a finite mode of God and thus certainly within the purview of God's infinite love of himself, of which we are a part. Therefore, an explanation of ILG must be mindful of how it is that God is both infinitely loving and not loving of us in return to our love for him.

The problem of reciprocity is less a philosophical problem, and more an existential one. This is especially so for those committed to traditional religious conceptions of the Deity, religious institutions, and practice, insofar as these all depend on the "God of history," a God present and involved in mundane and human affairs, who is capable of responding to worldly and human events and desires. For those committed to the "God of the philosophers," or, better yet, to Spinoza's conception of God, Spinoza offers us alternative means for assuaging our existential concerns, namely, ILG. For now, however, Spinoza's assertion that "He who loves God cannot endeavour that God should love him in return," *prima facie*, seems to undermine the very notion of theurgy, and in turn the traditionally conceived functions of prayer and repentance, if not piety, or at least a major aspect of it, as well the traditional conceptions of providence, and divine reward. Moreover, it seems to contradict EVP36 wherein we find out that "the mind's intellectual love toward God is the love of God wherewith God loves himself… That is, the mind's intellectual love toward God is part of the infinite love wherewith God loves himself," of which the mind is a part. And it is to this internal contradiction that we turn first.

One possible avenue for easing the tension here is to focus on the words "cannot endeavour" (*conari non potest*) in the proposition itself. Giving it a normative reading understands the proposition as proscriptive, that one should not desire that God reciprocate love in return for one's love of God. This has the benefit of bracketing the question of the possibility of any such

reciprocation, disconnecting the fact that God does in fact love us (EVp36) from the question of it's being in return for our actions, specifically ILG. This last point is supported by the "in return" (*contra*) at the end of the proposition, which reinforces the idea that it is not wrong to want to be loved by God, which is in fact eternally and necessarily the case, but rather just wrong to expect it in return for our love. This is further supported when we look at the demonstration, where the argument focuses on the fact that were we to actually desire God's reciprocation we "would therefore desire that God… should not be God," i.e. no longer eternally necessary, which is absurd, and that this desire would in fact be one for pain (since our knowledge of the necessary and eternal nature of God is the basis of all pleasure), which, according to the doctrine of the conatus, is also absurd. This normative reading avoids the existential or religious anxiety of God's absence, leaving the question of God's presence, answered elsewhere, alone. Moreover, this could be one of those "practical advantages" listed at the end of EII, a social maxim that will assist in our "social relations," insofar as forfeiting futile endeavours, or the expectation of them, certainly has social benefits, if only in eliminating false hopes and their frustrations.[223] But all this is certainly not the whole case.

Another possible avenue of approach is to read "cannot" (*non potest*) as referring not to God, not as stating that God cannot love us, but as referring to us, and as stating that it is simply impossible for us to even have such a desire, let alone have it fulfilled. This is, in fact, precisely the argument of the demonstration, which, drawing on the conatus, argues that such a desire is impossible due to its inevitable frustration, insofar as properly understood it is a desire that God's nature change, and in response to an act of ours no less.

---

[223] Nadler makes this point extremely well with regards to the denial of personal immortality in Spinoza in several works. Cf.: Steven Nadler, "Eternity and Immortality in Spinoza's *Ethics*" in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* , No. 26, 2002, pp. 224-244. 1; Idem., "Hope, Fear, and the Politics of Immortality," in *Analytic Philosophy and History of Philosophy*, ed. Tom Sorell and G.A.J. Rogers (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 201–17; Idem., *Spinoza's Heresy: Immortality and the Jewish Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

A final possible avenue is to approach the issue from the side of God. This approach too, though to a lesser extent, is evident in the argument of the demonstration, specifically in the claim that our desire for reciprocation is in fact a desire "that God whom [one] loves should not be God." For God acts from eternity, and his "will and decree" is everywhere and eternally the same. Therefore, a desire that God respond directly, over and above as God already does through the eternal laws of Nature, to our actions, of all things, is in fact a desire that God's eternal nature be changed at the behest of the desires and actions of a finite mode, which is, in Spinoza's system, absurd.

The problem of reciprocity, phrased differently as a problem of God's presence, is a problem not unique to Spinoza. Moreover, the emotional concerns assuaged by reciprocity, primarily the deep need for the love and care of the Absolute, are otherwise sufficed by Spinoza, specifically through ILG, through a knowing joy of one's place in the natural order of things eternally necessitated in and through God's eternal essence – that God has already provided his love and care for us, certainly, but from eternity.

The Problem of the Eternity of the Mind:

If one were to consider only what one has read in this sub-chapter on the *Ethics* alone, and none of the literature review, the eternity of the mind may not induce the horror it seems to have. Eternity is all there is. Everything is an expression of God's eternal necessity. Frankly, I find the overwhelming power of imagined ideas, which can so effectively drown out our eternal and true selves as well as be so difficult to overcome, should be the problem were Spinoza to not have a complex geometrically demonstrated system designed precisely to achieve such an end.[224]

[224] A full treatment of this would take us too far afield, but it lies in the uncertainty of the imagination, and the vacillations of mind that it induces, and the desperation it causes in our responses.

Some readers may think a solution to the problem of the eternity of the mind requires an eternal physical correlate to the eternal mind. The essence of the body (a definite ratio of motion and rest), and, let us not forget, its cumulative effects over its lifespan, since to be is to cause, together constitute an individual. On a kind of inertial understanding this essence can be said to be *sub specie aeternitatis*. Parallel to how an effect is understood through its cause, no matter how temporally disparate the physical effect is, the physical effect still technically feels the force of the prior cause. This feeling may be diffuse, subconscious even, indirect, extremely remote, so minimal as to be completely statistically irrelevant, but it still ultimately requires the prior cause in its complete calculation and explanation, and it is still to be found in the idea of the body in the infinite intellect of God. This diffusion would be no more, and no less, perhaps even exactly parallel (!) to that of a single idea so removed from another in the infinite intellect. Moreover, as a consequence of this approach, a yet further effect of that temporally disparate effect would, technically, be effected by that original cause, by that original body, no matter the state of its present composition. There is a very real sense in Spinoza, for example, that both Lincoln and Hitler, even both King David and Nebuchadnezzar, and not just their minds, or the idea they represent, but their bodies as well, are still active in this world. The force of their movements still propagates, if only technically. The lack of an immediate presence of a body need not limit its being effective. This last solution need not satisfy us all, but it is there.

Consider, however, that a physical correlate to the mind all the way through eternity need not be necessary. Perhaps the parallelism of the attributes need not be read so strictly. In the literature review above we saw several scholars argue for just that. Bodies, after all, have weight, textures, densities, and numerous other properties which ideas do not. The same goes for ideas. Ideas are of something. Some ideas are reflexive, of themselves. These two facts, *inter alia*, neither

of which hold of extension, cause the attribute of thought to be different than the attribute of extension. If we add the fact that there are infinite attributes, thought, as the idea of the body, must also be of the idea of the mode under attribute A_3 - A_∞ as well. This makes the attribute of thought greater by arguably infinite orders of magnitude. Where is the clamor about those violations of parallelism?[225] Why is time, finite time of all things, itself an illusion for Spinoza, taken to be the thing that breaks inexcusably and incoherently violates the parallelism of the attributes? Provided we take ILG seriously, perhaps even as cardinal, a more generous understanding of the parallelism of the attributes strongly suggests itself. I leave it for others to counter.

In concluding our revisiting of the problems facing ILG, recall that it was never my intention to fully solve the problems facing the concept. Rather, the goal was to take ILG as cardinal, as it was for Spinoza, and see if these problems could be reconfigured from such a perspective and perhaps advanced on from there. From the perspective of ILG, the heart of Spinoza's *Ethics* and system, the problems do not seem too great. In fact, by placing ILG at the heart of Spinoza's system, those earlier propositions and ideas, at least hopefully, make a bit more sense now. ILG is cardinal to the *Ethics*.

III.F. *Political Treatise*.

Work on the unfinished *Political Treatise* (*TP*) began around 1675 or '76, not long before his sudden death in 1677, [226] but after the majority of the work on his *Ethics* was complete.[227]

There are three instances in the *TP* where ILG is mentioned. In *Chapter 2: Natural Right*, ever mindful to secure the freedom to philosophize and the right to free speech, certainly a core value of

[225] I'm being rhetorical. It does exist, just nowhere near as much or as loudly as the clamor over the eternity of the mind.
[226] Nadler (1999), p. 342- 9. *Works*, pp. 676-8.
[227] It is understood that Spinoza had a rather substantial draft of his *Ethics*, at that time consisting of three parts, with the last part containing much of what we find in Parts III-V in the *Opera*, by the late 1660's, having even put it aside in 1665 in order to compose the *TTP* of 1670.

his political thought as a whole, we find Spinoza discussing a familiar notion, the relative values of good and bad, and how their determination is found solely in the sovereign power as expressed in the constitution of the state. Turning to the state's main competitor with regards to the determination of values, Spinoza states that "as far as [the institution of] religion is concerned, it is also quite certain that the more a man loves God and worships him with all his heart, the more he is free and more completely obedient to his own self."[228] In *Chapter 3: Sovereign Powers*, we find the other two references. In laying out the limits of sovereign power, and again turning to its main competitor, institutional religion, Spinoza states that "the true knowledge and love of God cannot be subject to anyone's jurisdiction, as is also the case with charity towards one's neighbour… [and] as for external rites, it is certain that they can do nothing at all to help or hinder the true knowledge of God and the love that necessarily follows therefrom."[229] Thus, in the *PT*, the concept of ILG is discussed primarily within the context of the jurisdiction of sovereign authorities – how and in what way are they related, who can regulate what and why. In considering the more purely political focus of the *TP*, and its eschewing of such terms as 'salvation,' 'blessedness,' and 'eternal joy' for the more politically themed 'freedom' and 'autonomy', all of which indicate ILG and its eternal joy and happiness,[230] we find that freedom, autonomy, and good government, not only depend solely on ILG, or rather the degree to which it is attained, but that ILG is their highest aim and most complete expression. This is because freedom and autonomy, as well as the peace, safety, and stability of a state, essential means for happiness, all depend on the degree to which ILG is the aim of and to which it is realized in the state. Thus, once again, but this time politically speaking, the concept of ILG functions in the PT as *the telos* of good government, no matter the form, and precisely because it is so for all of humanity as well. As a result, the quality and value of a state or

[228] *PT* Ch. 2, p. 689.
[229] *PT* Ch. 3, p. 693.
[230] That this is true will become clearer as we proceed.

government is determined solely according to the degree to which and efficiency with which it manifests ILG.[231]

III.G. *The Letters*.

The Letters of Spinoza span from 1661 to shortly before his death in 1677. Despite their wide range of topics and addressees, ILG is found early in the correspondences, scattered throughout, and right up until the end. If "the technicality and abstractness of Spinoza's philosophical work have a crystalline power that keeps his personality at a distance, the Letters give us access to Spinoza as a man and the concrete reality of his life and work [; If] The Letters confirms what shows through his work only at moments- his personal character and his humanity,"[232] then it is to be found in the Letters, at least in part, in his concept of ILG.

Ep. 21, dated January 1665, is part of an early correspondence with the grain merchant Willem van Blyenbergh. In it, like in other letters, we find Spinoza vigorously defending himself and his ideas. In the context of responding to Blyenbergh's misconstrual of Spinoza's anti-anthropomorphic thoughts on God as the source of the perfections of the good we find Spinoza connecting ILG, blessedness, love, and knowledge of God. Reflecting on the equally eternally lawful nature of cause and effect and reward and punishment, Spinoza argues that "This will be obvious to everyone who attends simply to the following point, that our supreme blessedness consists in love towards God, and that this love flows necessarily from the knowledge of God that is so heartily urged on us. This can be readily demonstrated in a general way if only one has regard to the nature of God's decree, as I have explained in my Appendix.[233] I admit, however, that all those

[231] I would add "…, not only in its constitution or principles but in its effective endorsement of it as well."
[232] Michael Morgan (ed.), *Works*, p. 756.
[233] The appendix referred to here is that attached to the *PPC*, the *Cogita Metaphysica.*

who confuse God's nature with the nature of man are quite unqualified to understand this."[234] Thus, already in this early letter, we find here that reward and punishment as well as the source of the perfection of the good are elucidated in and through ILG. The concept plays a major role in his explanations of cause and effect as well as reward and punishment. In Blyenbergh's response, he is keen to recognize the importance of ILG for Spinoza, that it has caused Spinoza to "shun vice or villainy because they are opposed to [Spinoza's] own particular nature and would lead [him] astray from the knowledge and love of God.[235] If only we too would all be as keen as Blyenbergh.

Ep. 43 is dated around 1671. In it, *inter alia*, Spinoza is defending himself to Ostens against a third party charge of atheism and, perhaps worse for Spinoza, a misunderstanding of his philosophy. In defending himself against the specific charge of having "renounced all religion,"[236] we find Spinoza countering that he holds "that God must be acknowledged as the highest good, and that he must be loved as such in a free spirit. And that in this alone does our supreme happiness and our highest freedom consist. And further, that the reward of virtue is virtue itself… and lastly, that everyone is in duty bound to love his neighbour and obey the commands of the sovereign power."[237] Later Spinoza claims that virtue and ILG, be they dependent on God as judge or as necessary emanations from the divine nature, would still be of prime importance and the object of the highest desire.[238] He even herein states that "the reward of virtue is virtue itself," a turn of phrase we may recognize from EVp42.[239] Referring to his recently published *TTP* as further evidence, Spinoza highlights that there "the substance of the divine law and its supreme commandment is to love God as the highest good: that is, not from fear of some punishment (for love cannot spring from fear),

---

[234] Ep. 21, *Works*, p. 823.
[235] Ep. 22, *Works*, p. 830-1.
[236] Ep. 43, *Works*, p. 879.
[237] Ep. 43, *Works*, p. 879.
[238] Ep. 43, *Works*, pp. 879-80.
[239] "Blessedness is not the reward of virtue, but is virtue itself," *Works*, p. 382.

nor from love of something else from which we hope to derive pleasure … And whether I love God freely or through the necessity of God's decree, I shall still love God, and I shall be saved."[240] Thus, in Ep. 43 we find almost all the key components of ILG being mentioned: God, highest good, love, free spirit, supreme happiness, freedom, necessity, and even salvation. In defending himself, Spinoza herein makes reference to the key points of his philosophy and worldview. He makes reference to ILG.

Ep. 73 is dated to late 1675 and is part of a long running correspondence with Henry Oldenburg, who became the Secretary of the Royal Society in London in 1662. In the letter, Spinoza is yet again defending himself and his *TTP*. Taking dependence on miracle – which for Spinoza indicates an ignorance of causes, not divine will or grace – to be indicative of superstition, not religion, Spinoza expands to state that "for salvation it is not altogether necessary to know Christ according to the flesh; but with regard to the eternal son of God, that is, God's eternal wisdom, which has manifested itself in all things and chiefly in the human mind, and most of all in Christ Jesus, a very different view must be taken. For without this no one can attain to a state of blessedness, since this alone teaches what is true and false, good and evil."[241] Thus, Spinoza is here discussing salvation, blessedness, true and false, good and evil, and their dependence on our knowledge of God's eternal wisdom, "manifested in all things," i.e. Nature and its causal laws. In other words, ILG, minus the affective component here, is our salvation, blessedness, truth, and good.

Ep. 78 is another letter to Henry Oldenberg, dated to February 7th, 1676. In it, Spinoza is expatiating on the problem of responsibility in a deterministic system. Are we, ever acting solely through the laws of our own determined natures, worthy of blessedness? Should we, so determined,

[240] Ep. 43, *Works*, p. 880.
[241] Ep. 73, *Works*, p. 943.

be punished? To answer, Spinoza responds, "is it that God cannot be angry with them, or is it that they are worthy of blessedness, that is, the knowledge and love of God? If the former, I entirely agree that God is not angry, and that all things happen in accordance with his will. But I deny that on that account all men ought to be blessed; for men may be excusable, but nevertheless be without blessedness and afflicted in many ways."[242] Thus, while once again identifying blessedness and ILG, Spinoza here maintains that the ultimate effect of good action yet depends on us in his system, specifically in and through ILG.

III.H. *Hebrew Grammar*

The *Hebrew Grammar* is understood to have begun being written at the behest of Spinoza's friends around the time of completion or publication of his *TTP*, a work which helps explain the appearance of a grammar in Spinoza's oeuvre. In Ch. 7 of the *TTP*, Spinoza lays out his method for scriptural exegesis, his hermeneutic method, a method which depends in large part on an analysis of the language of the text, as well as of the author(s), editor(s), and intended audience(s). An analysis of the Hebrew language, essential for an understanding of the Hebrew Bible according to Spinoza's method, is brought to partial fruition in the unfinished *Hebrew Grammar*. It is an odd work in which to seek evidence for Spinoza's regard for ILG, but, nevertheless, it is found in the work, if minimally, and for the sake of exhaustiveness it will be discussed briefly.

In discussing that in Hebrew it is not absurd that nous should require an accusative, Spinoza provides the "example: 'the love of the Lord toward the sons of Israel' is thus expressed in the Scriptures: אהבת יהוה את בני ישׂראל, lit.: 'The lord's love of the children of Israel.' The noun 'love' requires the accusative just like the verb אהב 'to love': and similarly, many others will be found, of

[242] Ep. 78, *Works*, p. 952.

which in the Syntaxes. But this should by no means be passed over, that for this reason nouns can serve for infinitives, לאהב את יהוה 'to a love of the Lord,' for, 'to love the Lord,' ליראה יהוה, 'to a fear of the Lord' for 'to fear the Lord, לאשמה בה 'to a guilt by it,' and many more in this manner."[243] There are countless other instances Spinoza could have chosen to demonstrate this point about Hebrew. It should no longer be curious why he chose the love of God.

* * *

The purpose of this Chapter was to systematically examine the role and function of ILG throughout Spinoza's corpus. Grounded in the Intellectual Historical Excursus of Chapter II, the above argues that the concept of ILG is a – if not the – cardinal concept in Spinoza's oeuvre, just as it was for the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition. The preceding achieved this by simply presenting the concept as it is found throughout Spinoza's works, without bias, using Spinoza's own words. In each work, except perhaps the *Hebrew Grammar*, which nevertheless mentions the concept, itself a lagnappe for my argument, the concept of ILG was found to have a central role and function, consistently connecting God and humanity through knowledge, happiness, the good, and necessity. Spinoza's concept of ILG was also found to exhibit many of the same functions as it did in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition, which, to repeat, are: that it is the telos of human existence, the source and standard of all value, the ethical and political ideal, necessary for and consists of union or some kind of identity with God, grounded in knowledge of God and existence, and the cause of immortality or the eternity of the mind. This holds of ILG throughout Spinoza's entire corpus, and thus throughout his thought and life, thus demonstrating an impossible to

[243] *Hebrew Grammar*, Ch. 13, *Works*, p. 632.

overstate major parallel between the two that runs, once again, throughout Spinoza's works, thought, and life. The significant and substantial parallels between the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition and Spinoza, and perhaps even the influence of the former on the latter, can and should shed light not only on our understanding of ILG in Spinoza, but on the rest of Spinoza's works and thought in and through and the concept of ILG, as I began to do by revisiting the problems facing ILG in the sub-chapter on the *Ethics*.

Regarding the historical narrative provided at the end of Chapter II, we can now see where and how Spinoza fits in. It is in reconfiguring the concept of ILG within a system of the strictest, necessitarianism, determinism, and immanence, eschewing the transcendent completely, that Spinoza takes his place in the distinctive vein of intellectual history. It is precisely in his uncompromising naturalism (itself to be understood, perhaps, as a natural development within the tradition) and that he nevertheless not just upheld but completely imbued his system with ILG that he belongs to the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition, for, itself adapting to the needs of the time and the people, Spinoza seems to have adapted the concept for use for as long as naturalism reigns. If only we were to listen.

IV. Conclusion

IV.A. Taking Stock.

Throughout the dissertation I have been arguing on behalf of the fundamental importance of the concept of ILG for Spinoza – that it is a, if not the, cardinal concept and value in his philosophy. In Chapter I, in introducing the concept of ILG, I attempted to explain the various obstacles that have prevented us from recognizing ILG for what it is. Be it our own proclivities or biases, the concerns or climate of the age, or simply the complexity of the concept itself, let alone the system within which we find it, an adequate understanding of the concept of ILG in Spinoza, rarely even a desideratum, has continuously remained elusive. In the scholarship, when discussed at all, ILG is consistently identified as an ideal in Spinoza's thought and works, a concept and value of prime importance, but it has been nevertheless rarely treated as such. It is found but mentioned all too briefly, usually as supportive of other, assumedly more important, concepts or aspects of (certain interpretations of) Spinoza's thought and works. Moreover, when discussed directly, ILG was treated piecemeal at best, with the temporal aspect of the concept of ILG, the eternity of the mind, or rather supposed inconsistencies in its mechanism, taking center stage. Chapter I ended with a typology of the problems facing the concept of ILG. In Chapter II's Intellectual Historical Excursus, I grounded our engagement with Spinoza's concept of ILG itself, undertaken in Chapter III, in a comparative examination of the concept of ILG in three key works from three key representatives of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition – Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*, Crescas' *Light of the Lord*, and Judah Abarbanel's *Dialogues on Love*. I presented the connections these thinkers and works had to Spinoza, justifying the discussion of them in particular. I then presented their respective concepts of ILG, indicating the abundant parallels between their concepts of ILG and that of Spinoza's, evidencing the argument for the inclusion of Spinoza into that distinctive vein

of intellectual history – that of the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition. This was followed by a brief historical narrative, plotting the steps in the development of the concept of ILG in this same vein and tradition, from Maimonides, through Crescas and Abarbanel, and to Spinoza. The Chapter also provided a list of distinctive features of the concept of ILG derived from this vein of intellectual history, including that it is the perfection and telos of human existence, the source and standard of all value, an ethical and political ideal, that it leads to and consists of union or some kind of identity with God, it is grounded in knowledge of God and existence, and it guarantees eternity. In Chapter III, I systematically presented the concept of ILG in each of Spinoza's works, highlighting the substantial role and function that it plays throughout his corpus, and thus his thought in general and indeed throughout his life. Much as we saw in Chapter II with the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition, it was shown that for Spinoza, throughout his thought, works, and life, ILG functions as, *inter alia*, the perfection and telos of human existence, the source and standard of all value, an ethical and political ideal, that it leads to and consists of union or some kind of identity with God, it is grounded in knowledge of God and existence, and it guarantees eternity. Therefore, the case that Spinoza's concept of ILG is a, if not the, cardinal concept and value in all of his thought and philosophy, just as it was for the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition, has been made. No other concept is more consistently present. No other concept does more work. Spinoza's conception of God or Nature not only culminates in his conception of ILG, of absolutely infinite existence brimming with knowing joy of its own infinite potential, but, I maintain, is designed from the very beginning with the sole purpose of maximally contributing to this highest and indeed only inherent good of his. His epistemology and psychology, too, not only culminate in but are designed to maximally contribute to, by guiding us to, the highest form of knowing and feeling that is ILG. This applies just the same to his conceptions of blessedness, salvation, freedom, especially since they

are all synonyms for ILG. The eternal and absolute necessity of existence, recognized, understood, felt, and experienced only in ILG, is all there really is, is all we really are, is all there is to know. All else is illusion, imaginative errors drawn from the random order of experience regarding the purposes and possibilities of things which give rise to durational vacillations of the mind and heart. Even his ethical, political, and religious, thought, topics to be briefly revisited below, must be understood as not only culminating in, but as dependent on, and solely intended to maximally contribute to, ILG.

Accordingly, and in conclusion, I now turn to three issues of central importance for Spinoza – ethics (axiology and the very possibility of ethics), politics (the freedom to philosophize, the right to free speech, and democracy), and religion (both his critique of religion and his arguments on behalf of religious toleration) – bringing to bear the full force and weight of the concept of ILG by using the concept of ILG as a hermeneutic lens. In taking ILG as cardinal and using ILG as a hermeneutic principle in engaging these three pillars, really, of his thought, the goal is modest: simply to demonstrate their dependence on and contribution to ILG. This is in order to further cement the argument on behalf of the cardinality of the concept and value of ILG for Spinoza by evidencing the explanatory strength of ILG, and thus its fundamentality for *any* understanding of Spinoza. I will end with a few brief thoughts on the ramifications of such an understanding of Spinoza's thought and corpus as presented in this dissertation for certain ideas and values of the modern Western age which so depend on Spinoza.

IV.B. The Cardinality of the Intellectual Love of God for Spinoza.

Despite the title of his chief philosophical work, *Ethics*, Spinoza's philosophy would seem to pose a particularly difficult challenge for ethics. His radically determinist metaphysics precludes free-

will. Everything, including our desires and choices which determine our actions, is determined, even over-determined, by myriad nigh infinite causes, most of which we know nothing about. As such, issues of agency, such as those of choice, responsibility, duty, and, in turn, punishment – indeed much of morality – becomes trivial, if not nonsensical. His radical philosophy of immanence precludes any and all transcendence. There is no supernatural in Spinoza's metaphysics, neither as source or creator, nor as Lawgiver or Judge. God is the immanent cause of existence, not transcendent,[1] and modes must be and be conceived in and through God.[2] This precludes any and all heteronomously imposed or decreed sources and standards of value for existence. There is no revealed Law, understood as the prophetic expression of God's will, only the eternal and infinite laws of God or Nature. Everything is but "a question of lines planes and bodies."[3] Reality, power, the necessity of existence, all identical, is the only good. His thoroughgoing critique of teleology or final causes, an active locus of recent scholarly concern, only further complicates these issues. For, assumedly, in precluding ends, the other for the sake of which things or even existence as a whole exist, the integral connection between purpose and value is severed.[4] Spinoza, as Maimonides before him, and common in the medieval Jewish philosophical tradition discussed in Chapter II, even holds that "good" and "evil" or "bad" are relativistic, utilitarian concepts, grounded in the falsehoods and uncertainties of the imagination, and having no basis in objective reality. What is of consequence is truth, not good.

This whole axiological issue, the cold impersonal vacuous existence of his system, was

---

[1] EIp18
[2] EID5, p15 pp. 217, 224-7, respectively.
[3] EIIIPref., *Works*, p. 278.
[4] The critique of teleology is found for the most part in the Appendix to EI and the Preface of Part IV. *Pace* Bennett, it is taken by most scholars to be a critique of teleology tout court. No wonder he and those of his ilk completely fail to understand ILG. Cf. *Spinoza: Issues and Directions* (2011) for only the latest round of what I like to call "much-ado about the critique of teleology." For an interesting and more nuanced take on the function of Spinoza's critique of teleology see: Melamed's forthcoming work on "The Causes of Our Belief in Free Will: Spinoza on Necessary, 'Innate', Yet False Cognition," kindly shared with me in draft form.

recognized and argued with great vitriol by many critics of Spinoza, even before the publication of the *Opera Posthuma*. Intrigued by the rumors swirling around Spinoza about the supposedly monstrous vision of his atheistic materialistic philosophy, people of various states and churches, professional societies and universities, including more prominent figures such as Leibniz, sought out Spinoza's works to verify the rumors for themselves. The issue, however, was stated most forcefully and argued most cogently by F.H. Jacobi, during what came to be known as the *Pantheissmustreit*, the Pantheism Controversies, in the 1780's. A controversy about the scope and limits of reason, indeed, about its very place in society, Jacobi found in Spinoza's philosophy the most consistent and thus archetypal example of the rationalist position. Such a rationalist position was taken to understand all of existence to be a matter of cause and effect, and thus, in principle, knowable to the human mind due its being open to full explanation via natural mechanistic causal laws. This, Jacobi argued, thus necessarily leads to atheism, fatalism, and inevitably to nihilism, a term he himself coined for the axiological vacuousness of reason if left unchecked.

It would seem, however, that Jacobi failed to keep reading to the end of the *Ethics*. For, as some scholars have noticed,[5] but consistently fail to follow up on, the conatus, that essential motivating force, the striving which defines each and every individual finite mode, can be understood as in fact teleological. Taking ILG as cardinal, and using ILG as a hermeneutic lens, that this must be so is even more clearly the case. The telos of the conatus, then, is largely[6] internal or immanent to itself. It is its own perseverance and flourishing. But, it is also identical to the intellectual love of God, a knowing joy of the necessity of one's place in existence, a knowledge which, as we've seen, includes knowledge of the necessity of the rest of existence, if only ideally, as

[5] Cf. the literature review above (I.1.B), especially the works of Rice, and few others.
[6] By "largely" I simply mean to denote that our actions, our effects, even the most actively caused ones, are never solely our own, and a recognition of this fact, as mentioned already in the literature review, can be understood to, in knowing the other causes, transcend the self.

well. This telos, while again largely internal to each mode, immanent to it, is also universally common, or absolutely universal. This is because ILG is the telos of both the infinite finite modes, the infinite *conatii* that make up existence, and the one infinite substance, insofar as all modes are and are conceived in substance, and the divine ILG just is, at least for the most part,[7] the sum total of modal ILG. ILG is the eternal state and act of God, Nature, all of existence. It is the happiest, most perfect, blessed, and true state of every mode, of every conatus. The degree of realization of this fact about one's self constitutes the degree of perfection of the one achieving the realization, and, as a result, the degree of perfection of greater and greater orders of being of which the original one is ultimately a part of. This process even extends to all of Nature and existence. ILG, if only due to its being the eternal state of God, but in reality due just as much to its role and function in and throughout his thought, is the ideal of Spinoza's philosophy. It is thus not only the highest good, something explicitly stated of it by Spinoza, but it is in fact the only inherent good. This is because all other goods are good only to the extent that they contribute to an increase in or maintaining of ILG. ILG is the thus the source and standard of all value. Being a realization of the necessity and perfection of all being and its immanental causal dependence on God, it is the standard of judgment, because, on one, albeit crucial, level it is all that exists. The identification of reality, power, being and good with ILG makes it all so. Therefore, value, and the very possibility of ethics in Spinoza's system must be seen as depending entirely on ILG, both on its realization and maximization.

Though one work is unfinished, Spinoza effectively left us with two political works – The *PT* and the *TTP*, respectively. As presented in Chapter III above, the concept of ILG has a substantial presence in both of them. In order to demonstrate the explanatory strength of ILG, we turn to the explicit intentions of the two works, to illustrate their ultimate dependence on and contribution to

[7] I leave the question of whether or not Substance is merely the sum total of its modes for another day.

ILG.

Spinoza's intention in the *TTP*, according to the text, and especially the title of the work,[8] is to argue on behalf of the freedom to philosophize (*libertas philosophandi*). He achieves this in large part through a devastating critique of religion, superstitious religion, the chief obstacle, according to Spinoza, to this right. Systematically dismantling the reigning theological understandings of essential religious concepts and beliefs in his critique, and thus the foundation of religion's authority over the freedom to philosophize, Spinoza treats of: prophecy, prophets, chosenness, Law/law, religious ritual and praxis, miracles, hermeneutics, divine and even prophetic authorship, the very origins, content, and purpose of scripture, faith itself, and the relationship between theology and reason.[9] In the last five chapters of the *TTP*, however, Spinoza turns positive, more explicitly political, discussing the foundations of the state, the rights of citizens and sovereigns, the political history of the Hebrew nation, the relationship between, to use an anachronism, church and state – "religion" and "sovereign," and the right to free speech.[10] That the *TTP*'s discussion of religion derives from, depends on, and contributes to the concept of ILG will be discussed immediately after the discussion of how Spinoza's politics does just that with regards to ILG itself. As indicated earlier in the literature review, that ILG must be understood as a social principle, in uniting love of neighbour with love of God, has been sufficiently fleshed out in the scholarship. There is little need to rehash that almost obvious by now point, and doing so would take us far afield. In what follows, I thus indicate how the freedom to philosophize and the right to free speech, pillars of Spinoza' political thought (and, in fact, much of modern Western society), and rightfully frequent subjects of

[8] The title page of the *TTP* reads, in part:" The Theological Political Treatise: Containing Various Disquisitions, by means of which it is shown not only that Freedom of Philosophizing can be allowed in Preserving Piety and the Peace of the Republic: but also that it is not possible for such Freedom to be upheld except when accompanied by the Peace of the Republic and Piety Themselves" (*Works,* p. 387, slightly modified).

[9] This list corresponds to Chs. 1-15 of the *TTP* and focuses only on what their titles explicitly claim to intend. There is obviously much more in these chapters.

[10] This list roughly corresponds to Chs. 16-20 of the *TTP* and, once again, focuses only on what their titles explicitly claim to intend. There is, once again, obviously much more in these chapters,

politically concerned scholarship on Spinoza, derive from, depend on, and contribute to ILG.

For Spinoza, the concept of a finite mode encompasses both individual citizens and the state.[11] Modes, insofar as they exist, have inherent value insofar as being itself is the only thing of inherent value. Their conatus or essence is a striving to persevere, to thrive, to increase in power, to increase their ILG. Everything that is good for them, that increases their power, their ILG, is right for them, and vice versa. This is because an increase in their power, in their fullest and maximal expression, is at the same time an increase in being, and thus good. In Spinoza's system, the fullest and complete expression of absolutely infinite substance is manifested in and through the infinity of finite modes. This fullest and maximal expression must include expression of thought in speech. For, only free speech allows for the individual, fellow citizens, the marketplace of ideas, the state, and even intellection itself, to correct itself according to its own rules of reason, according to knowledge of the necessity of things, not hope, fear, or superstition. The converse, censorship of any kind,[12] is simply untenable in Spinoza's system. Therefore, the freedom to philosophize, a species of the more broad freedom of speech, itself argued for by Spinoza, must be understood precisely as the freedom to engage and express one's ILG, to strive to increase it, and, in turn, one's power, one's being, as well as those of the greater and greater individual modes one is a part of. Thus, again, its cardinality.

As for Spinoza's endorsement of democracy, the intention of Spinoza's unfinished *TP*,[13] it too must be understood as dependent on and contributing to ILG because it is the political regime most conducive to free speech, the fullest expression and maximal flourishing of all modes/citizens,

[11] To my understanding, the concept of a mode has no finite physical limit, culminating in "the face of the whole universe, which, although varying in infinite ways, yet remains always the same" Ep. 64, *Works*, p. 919. EIIp13S, *Works*, p. 255, reads: "If we thus continue to [expand our concept of a mode to] infinity, we shall readily conceive the whole of Nature as one individual whose parts - that is, all the constituent bodies vary in infinite ways without any change in the individual as a whole."

[12] Except for perhaps the most seditious and imminently dangerous of topics for the "peace and piety" of the state.

[13] Arguments on behalf of democracy can be found in the *TTP*, specifically Ch. 16, as well, and are being drawn on in what follows.

or, to phrase it differently, and as discussed immediately above, ILG. Monarchy and oligarchy prioritize the freedom, flourishing, ILG, and free speech of a select few, and usually at the extreme suffering of others. Only democracy secures the natural right of each mode, from the diverse citizenry up through progressively larger bodies and institutions up to the state itself, to fully express itself and to strive, on an equal playing field, to flourish maximally, again, in short, to increase ILG.

That Spinoza's positive philosophy of religion, his universal civil religion expounded chiefly in Ch. 14 of the *TTP*, and elsewhere, as well as his arguments for religious toleration, depends on and contributes to ILG is perhaps by now obvious. If ILG is the source and standard of all value, then civil religion, insofar as it is valuable, must depend on and contribute to ILG, the highest and in fact only inherent good. ILG is itself a deeply religious concept and value having its roots in the Hebrew Bible and a long and deep history since. That Spinoza's metaphysics is so drastically different from his predecessors, itself something this dissertation and other scholarship can be used to argue against, changes the religiosity of ILG very little. It is still a principle and value grounded in the knowledge and love of God, the realization of our ultimate dependence on and identity with God. It still guarantees eternity, if occasionally understood to be an impersonal one.[14] Thus, once again, Spinoza's positive philosophy of religion must be understood within the context of maximizing ILG.

Much as I argued above about the right to free speech, the freedom to philosophize, and democracy, religious toleration is grounded in and contributes to ILG in much the same way. Being a value of Spinoza's, it must depend on and contribute to ILG, again, the highest and indeed only

[14] The impersonal nature of the immortality or eternity of the mind offered by Spinoza has been effectively justified by Nadler as intentionally designed to counter the hope and fear generated by the idea of a personal immortality, perhaps the most potent weapon of oppression and obedience used by superstitious religion. Nevertheless, Spinoza's metaphysics does possibly offer a way to maintain some degree or notion of personal identity in eternity, insofar as the random order through which we experience and come to learn of things, something uniquely ours, is never fully overcome or relinquished. The associative processes of the mind are on some level uniquely personal.

inherent good. If the telos of each conatus is largely internal to it, then one's relationship to God is a deeply personal fact, exclusive to them to the extent that their telos is internal to their selves and their being uniquely caused by God. One's religious expression, a form of expression, and itself a form of free speech, or at least conceivable as such even by Spinoza's principles, thus stands on the same universal grounds as free speech, and democracy, or even just expression and flourishing generally speaking, as something maximally contributing to ILG and thus a right to be secured and defended.

Once one realizes that ILG is in fact the source and standard of all value, the above arguments that grounded ethics, politics, and religion, or even just those aspects of them explicitly discussed above, in and towards ILG, can be replicated to include anything, absolutely everything, of value for Spinoza. In fact, I maintain it should in fact be so applied. The explanatory strength of ILG could not be any greater. It may even be argued, especially insofar as it is identical with being, reality, and power, rightfully understood, an act itself only achieved in and through ILG, that it is the only explanatory factor. Perhaps I too have become an "ILG-*drunkener mentsch*," to paraphrase Goethe, but it is my hope and intention here that we all become so as well, for the case for the cardinality of ILG has been made.

IV.C. Final Thoughts.

If the above dissertation is found to be convincing, what does that mean? So what? What if scholarship were to question its current prioritization of certain aspects, concepts, axioms, and propositions, most of which are found quite early in the *Ethics* , or are selected by concerns external to Spinoza, and which, in turn, have greatly biased almost all prior interpretations of Spinoza's thought against the concept of ILG? What if they took ILG seriously, let alone cardinally? Perhaps,

rather than being rarely found at the end of a work on some aspect of Spinoza's thought, ILG will be found more often at the beginning, or even throughout the work, as the foundation to and end of both the chosen topic and the examination of it, something it has been shown rightfully to be. Perhaps the above will help make better sense of those instances where Spinoza speaks positively of the ancient Hebrews (or religion), likening his understanding of God and existence to theirs, if corrupted or confused since.[15] What about beyond the world of Spinozana? What if we as a society were to question our congenially selected aspects of Spinoza's thought which we have formed into pillars of our Western civilization? What if we sought to base all not on a system of divine transcendence, but rather on a system of divine immanence, specifically the immanence of divine necessity and of love, just as Spinoza did? What of those other aspects of Spinoza's thought we have purloined, overtaken, appropriated, and supplanted? What if the scientific world view that so heavily dominates our society, that itself, much like Spinoza's philosophy, recognizes no transcendence, no supernatural, no transcendent final cause, can be conceived as no longer counter to ILG, but grounded in and maximally contributing to ILG? Would religious wars amount to extremely heated theo-scientific debates? What does a political theology of immanence look like? Answering these questions in any satisfactory fashion would require a separate dissertation, at least. What I can say, however, is that Spinoza certainly thought such grounding of value, ethics, politics, religion, even the modern scientific worldview, and more, in ILG to be not only possible or rationally tenable, but as maximally contributing to ILG, indeed the truest and thus only tenable system. He even made significant headway in arguing for and developing such a system, all with ILG at its heart.

[15] "I entertain an opinion on God and Nature far different from that which modern Christians are wont to uphold. For I maintain that God is the immanent cause, as the phrase is, of all things, and not the transitive cause. All things, I say, are in God and move in God, and this I affirm together with Paul and perhaps together with all ancient philosophers, though expressed in a different way, and I would even venture to say, together with all the ancient Hebrews, as far as may be conjectured from certain traditions, though these have suffered much corruption," Ep. 73, *Works*, p. 942; Or the "as if through a cloud" of EIIp7S, *Works*, p. 247, discussing how the ancient Hebrews almost understood extension as an attribute of God.

By focusing on the concept of ILG, in arguing for its being taken as cardinal, as the orienting concept and value of Spinoza's thought and works, I find I have completed what the dissertation has set out to do. Were the dissertation taken to have succeeded at this end and at the same time to have pointed to the above questions, however distantly in the future, the present author would rest content, comforted by the idea that Spinoza would, ever cautiously, agree with the foregoing contribution to ILG.

Bibliography

Altmann, Alexander. "Ars Rhetorica in Some Jewish Figures of the Italian Renaissance." In *Essays in Jewish Intellectual History*, 97–118. London: University Press of New England, 1981.

Andrault, Raphaële., Mogens Lærke, and Pierre-François Moreau. *Spinoza, Leibniz: rencontres, controverses, réceptions*. Vol. 15. Travaux et documents / Groupe de recherches spinozistes. ; Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne (PUPS), 2014.

Angel, Marc D. "Judah Abrabanel's Philosophy of Love." *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought* 15, no. 3 (Fall 1975): 81–88.

Bagley, Paul J. *Philosophy, Theology, and Politics: A Reading of Benedict Spinoza's Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Balibar, Etienne, and Warren Montag. *Spinoza and Politics*. Translated by Peter Snowdon. London ; New York: Verso, 2008.

Bamberger, Fritz. *Spinoza & Anti-Spinoza Literature: The Printed Literature of Spinozism 1665-1832*. Edited by Laurel S. Wolfson and David J Gilner. Cincinnati, Ohio: Hebrew Union College Pr, 2003.

Beiser, Frederick C. *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte*. Reprint edition. Harvard University Press, 1993.

Bell, David. *Spinoza in Germany from 1670 to the Age of Goethe*. London: Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London, 1984.

Ben-David, Tirzah. "Spinoza: Jewish Philosopher or Heretic?" *European Judaism: A Journal for the New Europe* 30, no. 2 (Autumn 1997): 112–19.

Bennett, Jonathan. *A Study of Spinoza's Ethics*. Second Printing edition. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1984.

Bidney, David. *The Psychology and Ethics of Spinoza. A Study in the History and Logic of Ideas.* First Edition edition. Yale Univ Press, 1940.

———. "Value and Reality in the Metaphysics of Spinoza." *The Philosophical Review* 45, no. 3 (May 1936): 229–44.

Boros, Gabor, Herman De Dijn, and Martin Moors, eds. *The Concept of Love in 17th and 18th Century Philosophy*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2007.

Boucher, Wayne. *Spinoza In English, A Bibliography*. 2nd edition. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1999.

Brochard, Victor. "L'Eternite Des Ames Dans La Philosophie de Spinoza." *Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale* 9, no. 6 (November 1901): 688–99.

Brown, Stuart. "Locke as Secret 'Spinozist': The Perspective of William Carroll." In *Disguised and Overt Spinozism Around 1700*, 213–34. Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Bruder, Kenneth John. *Baruch Spinoza's Logic of the One or One Act of Love*. Bamberg: Difo-Druck Schmacht, 1970.

Bunge, Wiep Van. *Spinoza Past and Present: Essays on Spinoza, Spinozism, and Spinoza Scholarship*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 215. Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill, 2012.

Bunge, Wiep Van, and Wim Klever, eds. *Disguised and Overt Spinozism Around 1700: Papers Presented at the International Colloquium Held at Rotterdam, 508 October 1994*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 69. Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Byrne, L. "The Geometrical Method in Spinoza's Ethics." *Poetics Today* 28, no. 3 (September 1, 2007): 443–74.

Caird, John. *Spinoza*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1888.

Chalier, Catherine. *Spinoza, lecteur de Maimonide*. CERF edition. Paris: CERF, 2006.

Cohen, Hermann. *Hermann Cohen: Spinoza on State & Religion, Judaism & Christianity*. Translated by Robert S. Schine. Jerusalem: Shalem Press, 2015.

Cohen, Morris R. "Amor Dei Intellectualis." In *Chronicon Spinozanum*, 3: 3–19, 1923.

Colerus, John. *The Life of Benedict de Spinosa*. In *Spinoza. His Life and Philosophy* .Translated by Sir Frederick Pollock. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1880.

Connolly, William E. "Spinoza and Us." *Political Theory* 29, no. 4 (2001): 583–94.

Cook, J. Thomas. "Did Spinoza Lie to His Landlady?" In *Piety, Peace, and the Freedom to Philosophize*, edited by P.J. Bagley, 209–31. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.

Cooper, Julie E. *Secular Powers: Humility in Modern Political Thought*. Chicago ; London: University Of Chicago Press, 2013.

Cooperman, Bernard Dov, ed. *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century*. Harvard University Press, 1983.

Curley, Edwin. *Behind the Geometrical Method*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1988.

———. "Notes on a Neglected Masterpiece: The Theologico-Political Treatise as a Prolegomenon to the Ethics." In *Central Themes in Early Modern Philosophy: Essays Presented to Jonathan Bennett*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1990.

———. "Notes on Immortality of the Soul in Spinoza's Short Treatise." *Giornale Critico Della Filosofia Italiana* 8 (1977): 327–36.
———. "The Immortality of the Soul in Descartes and Spinoza." *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 75 (2001): 27–41.
———. *Spinoza's Metaphysics*. Harvard University Press, 1969.

Curley, Edwin, and Pierre-François Moreau, eds. *Spinoza: Issues and Directions : The Proceedings of the Chicago Spinoza Conference*. Leiden ; New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 1997.

Damiens, Suzanne. *Amour et Intellect Chez Leon L'Hebreu*. Toulouse: Edouard Privat, 1971.

De Dijn, Herman. *Spinoza: The Way to Wisdom*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Research Foundation, 1996.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. Translated by Robert Hurley. First Edition in English. San Francisco: City Lights Publishers, 2001.

Dobbs-Weinstein, Idit. "Maimonidean Aspects in Spinoza's Thought." *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 17, no. 1–2 (1994): 153–74.
———. *Spinoza's Critique of Religion and Its Heirs: Marx, Benjamin, Adorno*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Donagan, Alan. "Spinoza's Proof of Immortality." In *Spinoza: A Collection of Essays*, edited by Marjorie Grene, 241–58. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1973.

Dujovne, León. *Spinoza: su vida, su época, su obra, su influencia.* Universidad de Buenos Aires. Facultad de filosofía y letras. Instituto de filosofía. Monografías universitarias, 6. Buenos Aires: [Imprenta López], 1941.

Dyroff, Adolf. "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Lehre Spinozas vom Amor Dei Intellectualis." *Archiv fur Philosophie* 1 (1918).

Ebreo, Leone. *Dialogues of Love*. Translated by Damian Bacich and Rossella Pescatori. Edited by Rosella Pescatori. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
———. *The Philosophy of Love*. Translated by. F. Friedeberg-Seeley and Jean H. Barnes. London: The Soncino Press, 1937.

Efros, Israel. "Wolfson's Philosophy of Spinoza." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 27, no. 3 (1937): 237–43.

Ellsiepen, Christof. "Types of Knowledge." In *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary*, 129–45. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2011.

Feldman, Seymour. *Philosophy in a Time of Crisis: Don Isaac Abravanel: Defender of the Faith*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

———. "A Debate Concerning Determinism in Late Medieval Jewish Philosophy." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 51 (1984): 15–54.
———. "Crescas' Theological Determinism." *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah* 9 (1982): 3–28.
———. "The Theory of Eternal Creation in Hasdai Crescas and Some of His Predecessors." *Viator* 11 (1980): 289–320.

Feuer, Lewis S. *Spinoza and the Rise of Liberalism*. New Brunswick, USA: Beacon Press, 1958.

Förster, Eckart, and Yitzhak Y. Melamed, eds. *Spinoza and German Idealism*. Cambridge England ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Foti, Veronique M. "Spinoza's Doctrine of Immortality and the Unity of Love." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 17 (1979): 437–42.

Fraenkel, Carlos. "Ḥasdai Crescas on God as the Place of the World and Spinoza's Notion of God as Res Extensa." *Aleph: Historical Studies in Science and Judaism* 9, no. 1 (2009): 77–111.
———. "Maimonides' God and Spinoza's Deus Sive Natura." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 44, no. 2 (2006): 169–215.
———. "From the Pythagorean Void to Crescas' God as the Place of the World." *Zutot: Perspectives on Jewish Culture* 5, no. 1 (2008): 87–94.

Freudenthal, Jacob. *Die Lebensgeschichte Spinoza's in Quellenschriften, Urkunden und Nichtamtlichen Nachrichten*. Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Comp, 1899.
———. *Zur Genesis Der Lehre Spinoza's Mit Besonder Berucksichtigung Des Kurzen Traktatis "Von Gott, Dem Menschen Und Dessen Gluckseligkeit"* . Breslau: Jewish Theological Seminar, 1871.
———. *Spinoza, leben und lehre*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1927.

Friedmann, Georges. *Leibniz et Spinoza*. Paris: Gallimard, 1946.

Fullerton, George Stuart. *On Spinozistic Immortality*. Boston, MA: Ginn & Co., 1899.

Funkenstein, Amos. *Theology and the Scientific Imagination from the Middle Ages to the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Garber, Daniel. "'A Free Man Thinks of Nothing Less Than of Death': Spinoza on the Eternity of the Mind." In *Early Modern Philosophy: Mind, Matter, and Metaphysics*, edited by Christia Mercer and Eileen O'Neill, 1–26. Oxford University Press, 2005.
———. "Spinoza's Theory of Scientia Intuitiva." In *Scientia in Early Modern Philosophy*, 99–115. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science 24. Dordrecht; N.Y.: Springer, 2010.

Garin, Eugenio. *History of Italian Philosophy*. Translated by Giorgio A. Pinton. Vol. 191. Value Inquiry Book Series. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008.

Gebhardt, Carl. *Spinoza opera*, 4 Vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Verlag,1925

———. *Leone Ebreo: Dialoghi d'amore*. Heidelberg, Amsterdam, London: Oxford University Press, 1929.
———. "Spinoza und der Platonismus." In *Chronicon Spinozanum* I (1921), pp. 178–234.
———. *Spinozas Abhandlung über die Verbesserung des Verstandes : eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Heidelberg : C. Winter, 1905.
Gebhardt, Carl, and Manfred Walther, eds. *Baruch de Spinoza: Lebensbeschreibungen Und Dokumente*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1998.

Gluck, Andrew L. *Judah Abrabanel Philosophy of Love and Kabbalah*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2012.

Goetschel, Willi. *Spinoza's Modernity: Mendelssohn, Lessing, and Heine*. 1 edition. Madison, WI.: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Goldenbaum, Ursula. "Pantheismusstreit - Milestone or Stumbling Block in the German Reception of Spinoza." In *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary*. Brill Academic Publishers, 2011.

Green, Alexander. "A Portrait of Spinoza as a Maimonidean Reconsidered." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 34, no. 1 (Fall 2015): 81–106.

Grene, Marjorie: Editor. *Spinoza: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979.

Grunwald, Max. "Judische Mystik." *Mitteilungen zur judischen Volkskunde* 25 (1923): 371–93.

Guidi, Angela. *Amour et Sagesse: Les Dialogues D'amour de Juda Abravanel Dans La Tradition Salomonienne*. Vol. 32. Studies in Jewish History and Culture. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Hallett, H. F. *Aeternitas: A Spinozistic Study*. 1st edition. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1930.
———. "Spinoza's Conception of Eternity." *Mind*, New Series, 37, no. 147 (July 1928): 283–303.

Hampe, Michael, Ursula. Renz, and Robert. Schnepf. *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary*. Vol. 196. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Hampshire, Stuart. *Spinoza and Spinozism*. 1st edition. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press, 2005.
———. "Spinoza's Theory of Human Freedom." *The Monist* 55, no. 4 (1971): 554–566.

Hardin, C.L. "Spinoza on Immortality and Time." In *Spinoza: New Perspectives*, edited by Robert W. Shahan and J. I. Biro, 129–38. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978.

Harris, Errol E. "Spinoza's Theory of Human Immortality." *The Monist*, 1971, 668–685.

Harvey, Steven. "The Influence of the Nicomachean Ethics on Medieval Jewish Thought." *Melanges de l'Universite Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth* 65 (2013): 119–42.

Harvey, Warren Zev. "'Ishq, Hesheq and Amor Dei Intellectualis." In *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy*, 96–107. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
———. "Spinoza on Biblical Miracles." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 74, no. 4 (2013): 659–75.
———. "Gersonides and Spinoza on Conatus." *Aleph: Historical Studies in Science and Judaism* 12, no. 2 (2012): 273–97.
———. "Canonical Sources for 'Glory' in Spinoza's 'Ethics.'" *Iyyun: A Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, October 1999, 447–49.
———. *Physics and Metaphysics in Hasdai Crescas*. Vol. 6. Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1998.
———. "Maimonides on Human Perfection, Awe, and Politics." In *The Thought of Moses Maimonides: Philosophical and Legal Studies*, edited by Ira Robinson, Lawrence Kaplan, and Julien Bauer, 17:1–15. Studies in the History of Philosophy. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.
———. "Crescas vs Maimonides on Knowledge and Pleasure." In *A Straight Path: Studies in Medieval Philosophy and Culture: Essays in Honor of Arthur Hyman*, 113–23. The Catholic University of America Press, 1988.
———. "A Portrait of Spinoza as a Maimonidean." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 19, no. 2 (1981): 151–172.
———. "The Return of Maimonideanism." *Jewish Social Studies* 42, no. 3/4 (1980): 249–268.
———. "Towards Identifying the Author of the Reservations contra Determinism in Hasdai Crescas' *Light of the Lord*" (1980) (Hebrew), pp. 794-801,
———. "Maimonides and Spinoza on the Knowledge of Good and Evil." *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly / עיון: רבעון פילוסופי* 28, no. 2/3 (1978): 167–85.
———. "Holiness: A Command to Imitatio Dei." *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought* 16, no. 3 (Spring 1977): 7–28.
———. "Love: The Beginning and the End of Torah." *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought* 15, no. 4 (Spring 1976): 5–22.
Harvey, W.Z. "Hasdai Crescas's Critique of the Theory of the Acquired Intellect." Columbia University, 1973 [Dissertation].

Heertum, Cis van. *Libertas Philosophandi. Spinoza as Guide to a Free World*. Amsterdam: Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica, 2008.

Hubbeling, H.G. "Hat Spinozas Gott (Selbst-)Bewusstsein?" *Zeitschrift fur philsophische Forschung* 31, no. 4 (December 1977): 590–97.

Huenemann, Charlie, ed. *Interpreting Spinoza: Critical Essays*. 1st edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Hughes, Aaron. "The Reception of Yehudah Abravanel among Conversos in the 17th Century: A Case Study of Abraham Kohen de Herrera." *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 14, no. 2 (2008): 461–75.
———. "Transforming the Maimonidean Imagination: Aesthetics in the Renaissance Thought of Judah Abravanel." *Harvard Theological Review* 97, no. 4 (2004): 461–484.
———. "Two Approaches to the Love of God in Medieval Jewish Thought: The Concept of Devequt in the Works of Ibn Ezra and Judah Halevi." *Studies in Religion/ Sciences Religieuses* 28, no. 2 (1999): 139–51.

Hyman, Arthur. "Spinoza on Possibility and Contingency." In *Meeting of the Minds: The Relations between Medieval and Classical Modern European Philosophy*, edited by Stephen F. Brown, 179–89. Brepols, 1998.
———. "Spinoza's Dogmas of Universal Faith in the Light of Their Medieval Jewish Background." In *Biblical and Other Studies*, edited by Alexander Altmann, 1:183–95. Studies and Texts. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Idel, Moshe. *Kabbalah & Eros*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005.

Israel, Jonathan. *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011.
———. *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights, 1750-1790*. Reprint edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
———. *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670-1752*. 1st edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
———. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
———. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*. Reprint edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

James, Susan. *Spinoza on Philosophy, Religion, and Politics: The Theologico-Political Treatise*. 1st edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Jarrett, Charles E. "The Development of Spinoza's Conception of Immortality." In *Dio, L'uomo, La Liberta: Studi Sul "Breve Trattato" Di Spinoza*, 147–88. L'Aquila, Rome: L.U. Japadre, 1990.

Joachim, Harold H. *A Study of the Ethics of Spinoza*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

Joel, Manuel. *Don Chasdai Creskas' Religionsphilosophische Lehren in Ihrem Geschichtlichen Einflusse*. Breslau: Schletter'sche Buchhandlung, 1866.
———. *Spinoza's Theologisch-Politischer Traktat Auf Seine Quellen Gepruft*. Breslau: Schletter'sche Buchhandlung, 1870.

Kashap, S. Paul, ed. *Studies in Spinoza: Critical Studies and Interpretive Essays*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Kasher, Asa, and Shlomo Biderman. "Why Was Baruch De Spinoza Excommunicated?" In *Spinoza: Critical Assessments*, 1:59–99. Routledge Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers. New York, NY: Routledge, 2001.

Kayser, Rudolph. "Amor Dei, An Approach to Spinoza's Philosophy of Religion." In *The Saints of Qumran: Stories and Essays on Jewish Themes*, 161–74. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1977.
Kisner, Matthew J. *Spinoza on Human Freedom: Reason, Autonomy and the Good Life*. Reprint edition. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
———. "Spinoza's Virtuous Passions." *The Review of Metaphysics* 61, no. 4 (June 2008): 759–83.

Kisser, Thomas. "The Third Category of Knowledge and the Rational Love of God." In *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary*. Brill Academic Publishers, 2011.

Klein, Julie R. "'By Eternity I Understand': Eternity According to Spinoza." *Iyyun: A Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly* 51 (July 2002): 295–324.

Klever, Wim. "Locke's Disguised Spinozism," 1995.
———. "Slocke, Alias Locke in Spinozistic Profile." In *Disguised and Overt Spinozism Around 1700*, 235–60. Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Kneale, Martha. "Eternity and Sempiternity." In *Spinoza: A Collection of Essays*, edited by Marjorie: Editor Grene, 227–40. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1973.

Kogan, Barry S., ed. *Spinoza: A Tercentenary Perspective*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Hebrew Union College Press, 1979.

Kreisel, Howard. "Imitatio Dei in Maimonides' 'Guide of the Perplexed.'" *AJS Review*, 1994, 169–211.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "Stoic and Neoplatonic Sources of Spinoza's Ethics." *History of European Ideas* 5, no. 1 (1984): 1–15.

Lærke, Mogens, Pierre-François Moreau, and Raphaële. Andrault, eds. *Spinoza et Leibniz : Rencontres, Controverses, Receptions*. Paris: PUPS, 2014.

Lamm, Julia A. *The Living God: Schleiermacher's Theological Appropriation of Spinoza*. Pennsylvania: University Park, 1996.
Lamm, Norman. "Maimonides on the Love of God." In *Maimonidean Studies*, edited by Arthur Hyman, 3: 131–42. New York, NY: Michael Scharf Publication Trust of Yeshiva University Press, 1992.

LeBuffe, Michael. *From Bondage to Freedom: Spinoza on Human Excellence*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Lerner, Ralph. "Maimonides' 'Treatise on Resurrection.'" *History of Religions* 23, no. 2 (1983): 140–155.

Levene, Nancy. "Ethics and Interpretation, Or How to Study Spinoza's TTP without Strauss." *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 10 (2000): 57–110.
———. *Spinoza's Revelation: Religion, Democracy, and Reason*. 1 edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Levy, Ze 'ev. "Rabbi Manuel Joel and His Research on Spinoza." *Da'at: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah*, no. 57/59 (2006): 165–78.

Lloyd, Genevieve, ed. *Spinoza: Critical Assessments*. Vol. 1–4. Routledge Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers. New York, NY: Routledge, 2001.
———. "Spinoza's Version of the Eternity of the Mind." In *Spinoza and the Sciences*, edited by Marjorie Grene and Debra Nails, 216–30. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1986.

Lucas, Jean Maximilian. *The Life of the Late Mr. de Spinosa*. In *Oldest Biography of Spinoza*. Edited by A. Wolf. New ed. of 2 ed. Port Washington, N.Y: Kennikat Press, 1927.

Lucash, Frank. "Spinoza on the Eternity of the Human Mind." *Philosophy & Theology* 5, no. 2 (1990): 103–13.

Lulmann, C. "Ueber den Begriff amor dei intellectualis bei Spinoza," 1884.

Mack, Michael. *Spinoza and the Specters of Modernity: The Hidden Enlightenment of Diversity from Spinoza to Freud*. 1st edition. N.Y: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010.

ben Maimon, Moses (Maimonides). *Guide of the Perplexed*, 2 Vols. Translated by Shlomo Pines. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Malapert, Paulin. "L'Amour Intellectuel de Dieu d'apres Spinoza." *Revue Philosophique* 26 (1888): 252–56.

Mason, Richard. *The God of Spinoza: A Philosophical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Matheron, Alexandre. "Remarks on the Immortality of the Soul in Spinoza." In *Spinoza's Ethics: A Collective Commentary*, 295–304. Brill Academic Publishers, 2011.

Matson, Wallace I. "Death and Destruction in Spinoza's Ethics." *Inquiry* 20, no. (1-4) (1977): 403–17.
———. "Spinoza's Theory of Mind." *The Monist* 55, no. 4 (October 1971): 567–78.

Maxwell, Vance. "Spinoza's Doctrine of the Amor Dei Intellectualis." *Dionysius* 14–15 (91 1990): 131–56.

McShea, Robert J. "Spinoza in the History of Ethical Theory," 427–35, 1977.

Mendes-Flohr, Paul, and Jehuda Reinharz, eds. *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, 1995.

Melamed, Yitzhak Y. "Spinoza and Some of His Medieval Predecessors on the Summum Bonum." In *The Pursuit of Happiness in Medieval Jewish and Islamic Thought*, edited by Nadja German and Yehuda Harper. Forthcoming.
———. *Spinoza's Metaphysics: Substance and Thought*. Reprint edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———, ed. *The Young Spinoza: A Metaphysician in the Making*. 1 edition. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
———, ed. *Spinoza's "Ethics": A Critical Guide*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Melamed, Yitzhak Y., and Michael A. Rosenthal, eds. *Spinoza's "Theological-Political Treatise": A Critical Guide*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Melamed, Yitzhak Y., and Oded Schechter. "Spinoza on Death, 'Our Present Life' & the Imagination." Forthcoming.

Miller, Jon. *Spinoza and the Stoics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Miny-Chustka, M. "Review of: La Judeite de Spinoza by Genevieve Brykman." *Studia Rosenthaliana* 8, no. 2 (July 1974): 310–12.

Montag, Warren, and Ted Stolze, eds. *The New Spinoza*. 1 edition. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Moreau, Pierre-François. *Spinoza et le spinozisme*. 1. éd. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003.
———. *Spinoza: L'experience et L'eternite*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994.

Nadler, Steven. *A Book Forged in Hell: Spinoza's Scandalous Treatise and the Birth of the Secular Age*. Reprint edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.
———. "The Jewish Spinoza." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70, no. 3 (July 2009): 491–510.
———. *Spinoza's "Ethics": An Introduction*. 1st edition. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
———. "Hope, Fear, and the Politics of Immortality." In *Analytic Philosophy and History of Philosophy*, edited by Tom Sorell and G.A.J. Rogers, 201–17. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
———. "Eternity and Immortality in Spinoza's Ethics." *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* XXVI (2002): 224–44.
———. *Spinoza's Heresy: Immortality and the Jewish Mind*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
———. *Spinoza: A Life*. 1st edition. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
———, ed. *Spinoza and Medieval Jewish Philosophy*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Neumark, David. "Crescas and Spinoza: A Memorial Paper in Honor of the Five Hundredth Anniversary of the 'Or Adonoi.'" In *Year Book of the Central Conference of American Rabbis*, Vol. 18. Cincinnati, Ohio: S. Rosenthal & Co., 1909.

Norris, Christopher. *Spinoza & the Origins of Modern Critical Theory*. Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell Pub, 1991.

Offenberg, Adri K. "Spinoza's Library. The Story of a Reconstruction." *Quaerendo* 3, no. 4 (1973): 309–21.

Ogden, Mark R. "Amor Dei Intellectualis: Holderlin, Spinoza and St. John." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift Fur Literaturwissenschaft Und Geistesgeschichte* 63, no. 3 (September 1989): 420–60.

Oksenberg Rorty, Amelie. "Spinoza's Ironic Therapy: From Anger to the Intellectual Love of God." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (July 2000): 261–76.

Parens, Joshua. *Maimonides and Spinoza: Their Conflicting Views of Human Nature*. Chicago ; London: University Of Chicago Press, 2012.

Perry, T.A. "Review of Damiens, Suzanne. Amour et Intellect Chez Leon L'Hebreu (Toulouse: Private, 1971)." *Modern Language Notes* 88, no. 2 (March 1973): 421–25.

Pollock, Sir Frederick. *Spinoza. His Life and Philosophy*. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1880.

Popkin, Richard. *Spinoza*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2004.

Preus, J. Samuel. *Spinoza and the Irrelevance of Biblical Authority*. 1st edition. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Ravven, Heidi M. "Some Thoughts on What Spinoza Learned From Maimonides about the Prophetic Imagination, Part 1. Maimonides on Prophecy and the Imagination." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 39, no. 2 (April 2001): 193–214.
———. "Some Thoughts on What Spinoza Learned From Maimonides on the Prophetic Imagination, Part 2. Spinoza's Maimonideanism." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 39, no. 3 (July 2001): 385–406.
———. "The Garden of Eden: Spinoza's Maimonidean Account of the Genealogy of Morals and the Origin of Society." *Philosophy & Theology* 13, no. 1 (2001): 3–51.

Ravven, Heidi M., and Lenn E. Goodman, eds. *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Rice, Lee C. "Love of God in Spinoza." In *Jewish Themes in Spinoza's Philosophy*, edited by Heidi M. Ravven and Lenn E. Goodman, 93–106. Albany, N.Y: SUNY Press, 2002.
———. "Paradoxes of Parallelism in Spinoza." *Iyyun: A Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly* (1999): 37–54.
———. "Le Nominalisme de Spinoza." *Canadia* 24, no. 1 (March 1994): 19–32.
———. "Mind Eternity in Spinoza." *Iyyun: A Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly* 41 (July 1992): 319–34.
———. "Reflexive Ideas in Spinoza." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 28, no. 2 (April 1990): 201–11.
———. "Spinoza, Bennett, and Teleology." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 23, no. 2 (1985): 241–52.
———. "Emotion, Appetition, and Conatus in Spinoza." *Revue Inter* 31, no. 119/120 (1/2) (1977): 101–16.
———. "Spinoza on Individuation." *The Monist* 55, no. 4 (October 1971): 640–59.

Rocca, Michael Della. *Spinoza*. New edition. London ; New York: Routledge, 2008.

Rodis-Lewis, Genevieve. "Questions sur la Cinquieme Partie de l'Ethique."' *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger* 176, no. 2 (Avril-Juin 1986): 207–21.

Rotenstreich, Nathan. "Conatus and Amor Dei: The Total and Partial Norm." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 31 (1977): 117–34.

Roth, Leon. *Spinoza*. Little, Brown, and Company, 1929.
———. *Spinoza, Descartes, & Maimonides*. 1st edition. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1924.

Runes, Dagobert D. *Spinoza Dictionary*. First edition. Philosophical Library, 1951.

Schechter, Oded. "Temporalities and Kinds of Cognition in the TIE, KV, and the Ethics." In *The Young Spinoza: A Metaphysician in the Making*, edited by Yitzhak Y. Melamed. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Schmaltz, Tad M. "Spinoza on Eternity and Duration: The 1663 Connection." In *The Young Spinoza: A Metaphysician in the Making*, edited by Yitzhak Y. Melamed, 205–20. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Schwartz, Daniel B. *The First Modern Jew: Spinoza and the History of an Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Servaas Van Rooijen, A.J. *Inventaire Des Livres Formant La Bibliotheque de Baruch Spinoza, Publie D'apres Un Document Inedit, Avec Des Notes Biographiques et Bibliographiques et Une Introduction*. La Haye: W.C. Tengeler, 1888.

Shahan, Robert W., and J. I. Biro, eds. *Spinoza: New Perspectives*. Second Printing edition. University Of Oklahoma, 1978.

Sharp, Hasana. *Spinoza and the Politics of Renaturalization*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2011.

Shein, Noa. "The False Dichotomy Between Objective and Subjective Interpretations of Spinoza's Theory of Attributes." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 17, no. 3 (2009): 505–32.

Siwek, Paweł. *L'âme et le corps d'après Spinoza (la psychophysique spinoziste)*. Collection historique des grands philosophes. Paris: F. Alcan, 1930.

Smith, Steven B. "What Kind of Democrat Was Spinoza?" *Political Theory* 33, no. 1 (February 1, 2005): 6–27.
———. *Spinoza's Book of Life: Freedom and Redemption in the Ethics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
———. *Spinoza, Liberalism, and the Question of Jewish Identity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
———. "Spinoza's Democratic Turn: Chapter 16 of the 'Theologico-Political Treatise."' *The Review of Metaphysics* 48, no. 2 (December 1994): 359–88.

Solmi, Edmondo. *Benedetto Spinoza e Leone Ebreo. Studio su una fonte italiana dimenticata dello Spinocismo*. Modena: G.T. Vincenzi e Nipoti, 1903.

Spinoza, Baruch. *Spinoza: Complete Works*. Translated by Samuel Shirley. Indiana, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2002.
———. *The Collected Works of Spinoza, Volume I*. Translated by Edwin Curley. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1985.
———. *Spinoza Opera*. 4Vols. Edited by Carl Gebhardt. Heidelberg: 1925.

Steinberg, Diane. "Spinoza's Theory of the Eternity of the Mind." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 11, no. 1 (March 1981): 35–68.

Stewart, Matthew. *The Courtier and the Heretic: Leibniz, Spinoza, and the Fate of God in the Modern World*. Reprint edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007.

Stock, Barbara. "Spinoza on the Immortality of the Mind." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 17, no. 4 (October 2000): 381–403.

Strauss, Leo. *Philosophy and Law: Contributions to the Understanding of Maimonides and His Predecessors*. Translated by Eve Adler. 1st edition. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.
———. *Persecution and the Art of Writing*. Reprint edition. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1988.
———. *Spinoza's Critique of Religion*. Translated by E.M. Sinclair. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Suhamy, Ariel. "Comment Parler de l'Eternite? Les Joies de La V-E Partie de l'Ethique.'" *Les Etudes Philosophiques* 2 (Avril-Juin 1997): 201–21.

Talbert, Matthew. "Virtue and the Intellectual Love of God: Freedom in Spinoza's Ethics." *Kinesis* 26, no. 2 (1999): 27–42.

Totaro, Giuseppina. "«Acquiescentia» Dans La Cinquième Partie de l'«Ethique» de Spinoza." *Revue Philosophique de La France et de l'Étranger*, 1994, 65–79.

Twersky, Isadore, and Bernard Septimus, eds. *Jewish Thought in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Uyl, Douglas J. Den. *God, Man, and Well-Being: Spinoza's Modern Humanism*. 1st edition. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

Vajda, George. *L'amour de Dieu dans la théologie juive du Moyen Age*. Études de philosophie médiévale 46. Paris: J. Vrin, 1957.

Vallee, Gerard. *The Spinoza Conversations Between Lessing and Jacobi*. Lanham: UPA, 2002.

Veltri, Giuseppe. "Philo and Sophia: Leone Ebreo's Concept of Jewish Philosophy." In *Cultural Intermediaries: Jewish Intellectuals in Early Modern Italy*, 55–66. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
———. *Renaissance Philosophy in Jewish Garb*. Vol. 8. Supplements to The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2009.

Vila-Cha, Jaoa J. *Amor Intellectualis? Leone Ebreo and the Intelligibility of Love*. Braga, Portugal: Publicacoes da Faculdade de Filosofia, 2006.

Viljanen, Valtteri. *Spinoza's Geometry of Power*. Reprint edition. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Walther, Manfred. "Was/Is Spinoza a Jewish Philosopher? Spinoza in the Struggle for a Modern Jewish Cultural Identity If Germany: A Meta-Reflection." *Studia Spinozana* 13 (1997): 207–40.

Walther, Manfred, and Carl Gebhardt, eds. *Baruch de Spinoza: Lebensbeschreibungen Und Dokumente*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1998.

Waxman, Meyer. "Baruch Spinoza's Relation to Jewish Philosophical Thought and to Judaism." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1929, 411–430.
———. *The Philosophy of Don Hasdai Crescas*. N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1920.
———. "The Philosophy of Don Hasdai Crescas: Chapter II." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, 8, no. 4 (April 1918): 455–75.

Wertheim, David J. "Spinoza's Eyes: The Ideological Motives of German-Jewish Scholarship." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (2006): 234–46.

Wolf, A., ed. *The Oldest Biography of Spinoza*. N.Y./London: Kennikat Press, 1927.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. "Spinoza on the Infinity of Corporeal Substance." In *Chronicon Spinozanum*, 4:79–103. Hague: Societatis Spinozanae, 1924.
———. *Crescas' Critique of Aristotle: Problems of Aristotle's Physics in Jewish and Arabic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.
———. *The Philosophy of Spinoza; Volumes 1 & 2*. Harvard University Press, 1934.
———. *Religious Philosophy: A Group of Essays*. First Edition. Belknap Press, 1961.

Yovel, Yirmiyahu. *Spinoza and Other Heretics. Vol. 1: The Marrano of Reason*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1992.
———. *Spinoza and Other Heretics. Volume 2: The Adventures of Immanence*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1992.
———. *Spinoza on Reason and the Free Man*. 1st edition. New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2004.
———. "Why Was Spinoza Excommunicated?" *Commentary* 64, no. 5 (November 1977): 46–52.

Zac, Sylvain. "Life in the Philosophy of Spinoza." *Philosophy & Theology* 1, no. 3 (1987): 255–66.

———. "The Relation between Life, Conatus, and Virtue in Spinoza's Philosophy." *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 19, no. 1 (1996): 151–173.
———. *L'idee de vie dans la philosophie de Spinoza*. Paris: PUF, 1963.

Zunz, Leopold. *Etwas über die rabbinische Litteratur*. Berlin: Maurersche Buchhandlung, 1818.