

Halina Świączkowska

University of Białystok

THE LEIBNIZIAN *UNFORGREIFFLICHE GEDANCKEN* AS A POLITICAL TREATISE

1. Introduction

Polish critical literature has given a little attention to the analysis of the Leibnizian political legacy. Leibniz as a politician, diplomat and active participant of the European political scene, has largely been overshadowed by Leibniz – the great duke of philosophy.¹ What is more, the philosopher's political publicism and his diplomatic engagement do not constitute a major trend of the analysis of the sources of the contemporary political thought and the beginnings of the shaping of the new German community, that is, the modern state, society, and nation.

Leibniz did not unfold his ideas in a systematic way. They are scattered in his rich correspondence and writings, only a part of which was printed during his life. Leibniz's political publicism, frequently revealing contrasting threads, constitutes his reflection upon the reality as seen by the thinker aiming at combining local interests of the state with the broadly understood interest of mankind. The philosopher's research objectivism is frequently faced with a practical approach of the mature diplomat. The whole of his political reflection is revealed by three major trends: a return to the religious union of the Western Christianity, Leibniz's attempts to organize science treated as a tool of the development of the state, international collaboration and inter-cultural agreements, as well as the analysis of the notion of power and its attributes. However, as J. Sitniewska proves, it is impossible to

¹ An unpublished PhD thesis entitled *Jedność Europy, wspólnota kultury, interes państwa. Dylematy myśli politycznej G. W. Leibniza*, written by Julita Sitniewska and defended at the University of Silesia in Katowice in 2005, is the only comprehensive study of the issue in the Polish literature.

discuss Leibniz's coherent system of political system as it is revealed by T. Hobbes or J. Locke.²

Frequently, commentators take a stand that Leibniz's political writings cannot be analysed without a prior consideration of the major assumptions of his philosophical system. Undoubtedly, certain ideas and projects present in political writings do become much more comprehensible when compared within this system. Nevertheless, one should not lose a sight of the temporary pursuits the philosopher was aiming at, acting frequently on behalf of full political powers of his protectors, which is illustrated by *Specimen demonstrationum politicarum*, commissioned by the baron von Boineburg and dealing with the support to be given to the candidate of the duke Philip Neuburg to the Polish throne after the abdication of King Jan Kazimierz.³

It is necessary to highlight here that Leibniz belonged to the supporters of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation as inheritors of the Roman and Carolinian traditions. His political writings fully support the unquestionability of the emperor's authority as the highest secular power in the Empire and in Europe.⁴ For him, the emperor is the first among equal rulers in Europe, a leader of the Christians, whose duty is protection of authentic faith and directing Christianity towards the highest virtue, which is proved in his *Unvorgreifliche Gedancken*, the work devoted to the totally different subject. In his political publicism not only did Leibniz take a stand as the German devoted to the interests of his patrons, rulers of the German states, but he also revealed himself as a diplomat engaged in the protection of the position of the emperor at the arena of international politics against the aggressive politics of Ludwig XVI. The role of the Empire was perceived by Leibniz in a traditional way – as a guardian of the European order. Moreover, he did not approve of the French cultural supremacy whereas the French king was perceived by him as the main source of the problems the Empire was suffering from.

² Ibid, typescript, p. 209.

³ See G. W. Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften Und Briefe*, Darmstadt 1923, Leipzig 1938, Berlin 1950, IV, I, pp. 3–98, (from now on marked as AA, I cited as Volume, Chapter, page).

⁴ J. Sitniewska, *Jedność Europy, wspólnota kultury, interes państwa*, cited typescript, p. 148. See also G. W. Leibniz *Caesarinnus Fürsternerius*, in: P. Riley, *Leibniz Political Writings*, Cambridge 1985, p. 111.

2. Political perspective of *Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken*⁵

This paper does not aim at the analysis of the whole of the Leibnizian political publicism. Nevertheless, it aims at highlighting the arguments for introducing the text *Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken* into Leibniz’s output as a political thinker in that part where the philosopher deals with the problems that are absolutely fundamental in the issue of constituting the basis of the contemporary German community.

Contrary to such countries as France, England or Russia, on the turn of XVII Century the Empire had formed neither a centralized structure of the state nor any state nation had been formed on its territory – a homogeneous union ruled centrally and inhabiting a certain area treated as a national state. That situation resulted in the reflection of the German intellectual elite and posed questions as to the future position of the Holy Empirer as well as the question regarding the future of its German-speaking inhabitants in the context of the possibility of uniting them into one state nation whose causative factors would be a common confession, similar range of experiences and, finally, a common language. Starting from the middle of XVII Century, the necessity of elaborating the mechanisms leading towards the formation of a homogeneous nation and state became visible. Within the German communities belonging to the Holy Empire of the German Nation that aim was pursued by a social group whose role was frequently marginalized in the contemporary political history for its members had no political background and, therefore, could not influence the course of political actions in the German states. On the other hand, their contribution was their engagement into the formation of the German culture. It was also them who started a discussion of the political problems regarding the state, society or nation. Samuel Pufendorf, Johhann Joachim Becher (1635–1682) and Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626–1692) belonged to the most significant thinkers representing that trend of the contemporary German enlightenment as well as (or perhaps, above all) Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz.⁶ Belonging to the wealthy middle class or nobility, those people owed their prestige almost exclusively

⁵ G. W. Leibniz, *Unvorgreiffliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der Teutsche Sprache*, in: G. G. Leibnitii, *Collectanea Etymologica, illustrationi linguarum, veteris Celticae, Germanicae, Gallicae, aliarumque inservientia*, cum praefatione Johannis Georgii Eccardi, Hanoverae 1917 (From now on cited as UG and the point).

⁶ See T. Namowicz (ed.), *Państwo a społeczeństwo. Wizje wspólnot niemieckich od oświecenia do okresu restauracji*, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań 2007, p. 8. Leibniz’s contributions in this matter are especially emphasized by P. Chaunu in *La civilisation de l’Europe des lumières*, B. Arthaud, Paris 1971, Part 1, Ch. 3.

to their university education which enabled them to hold a position in the state service in both the Empire and certain German states, Leibniz serving as the best example – holding a post simultaneously at the Hannover and Empire courts. This group is defined by the term **Bildungsbürgertum**. The term can hardly be given its English equivalent. Researchers claim that the term **intelligence** in the sense of a social group or **educated middle class** serves as its nearest synonym. The place of that social class in the structure of the German communities differentiated German states from the centralized English or French monarchies. What is more, it depended upon the feudal elites of power for generally it did not have any sources of income apart from the posts held, which is perfectly illustrated by the life situation of Leibniz.

T. Namowicz argues that a discussion of the social, political and national character of the state remained a marginal issue for the remaining social classes especially of the second half of XVII Century. Therefore, the elites of power, kings and dukes as well as the aristocracy connected with the ruling courts, were interested in keeping their *status quo*. On the other hand, the peasantry and uneducated middle class were characterized by their indifference towards issues of that character. The existence of many small states or the existence of one big state had no significance for the lower social class. The phenomenon of German federalism was a significant reason for the lack of interest in the processes of modernization. It was neither the Empire nor the territorially state but it was a bound with a small homeland being the most significant area of one's cultural or material existence that determined the identification of an individual as a member of the German community.⁷

According to the statistics gathered around 1770, it was estimated that only 20000 people (0,1% of the whole population in the Empire) were interested in the discourse regarding the situation in the Holy Empire. Undoubtedly, G. F. Leibniz was among the first ones to initiate that discourse. Initially, it focused on the problems of the state, which resulted from the special structure of the political life represented by the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. On the one hand, the place it was occupying in the history of the European statehood was marked by the idea of the universal Christian republic (*respublica christiana*). On the other hand, it was marked by the desire to highlight a national character of the Holy Empire. Characteristic is the fact that, although the term **Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation** (the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation) ap-

⁷ Ibid, p. 10.

peared after 1512, it was till the end of the Empire in 1806 that a traditional medieval term **Heiliges Römisches Reich** was used in which the discriminant “German nation” was omitted. It meant that in the European consciousness the Empire was not fully identified with a German state.⁸

A political treatise of 1648, which finished the Thirty-Year War, determined a political division of the Empire establishing above 300 sovereign territories in its structure. The Empire existed *de facto* as a conglomeration of territorial states. Although the majority was represented by the German-speaking inhabitants, the territory of the Empire was also inhabited by people who did not speak or use German in their daily life (e.g. inhabitants of Czech, Hungary, the duchy of Milano, Lotarginia, etc). On the other hand, many territories whose inhabitants spoke German did not belong to the Empire, which is well illustrated by the example of the Ducal Prussia which occupied the territories out of the Empire.

Paul Chaunu argues that after 1680 the Empire gradually continued the bits of political substance which remained after the demographic catastrophe of 1630–1640 and the Peace of Westphalia. A traditional tension North – South based on the religious criterion (the Protestant Germany – the Catholic Germany), which was also understood as efficiency and enlightenment opposed to ignorance, did not simplify the survival of the imperial myth. In the texts published in 1676–1689 while facing threats from France, there were some attempts made to establish common principles of trade to be used in every territorial state of the Empire. Peaceful Leibniz, being scientifically and intellectually close to Spinoza writing *Tractatus* to defend the lost Republican business and to Locke, a theorist of the winners of the Glorious Revolution, started a fight for the survival and protection of the traditional structure of the Empire and his thought adopted the expression of a political challenge.⁹

The awareness of the connection of the German states with the idea of the Empire as well as the recognition of the primacy of the Emperor over the German rulers along with the creation of the definition of the sovereignty of German duchies within the boundaries of the Empire made Leibniz an enthusiast of the German federation as opposed to Pufendorf who linked federation with the collapse of Reich.¹⁰ According to Leibniz, the connection between the Empire and the German states was a sufficiently good model of the statehood. The philosopher’s critique regarding that matter,

⁸ Ibid, p. 11.

⁹ P. Chaunu, *La civilisation de l’Europe des Lumières*, op. cit., Part I, Ch. 3.

¹⁰ See S. T. Namowicz (ed.), op. cit., pp. 69–82.

if appeared, dealt with the lack of respect of the law by the members of that federation, which partly resulted in the reduction of power of the Empire. Leibniz's attachment to the idea of the Empire as the community of the multitude of sovereign subjects creating its structure finds its justification when compared to the philosophical principle of *harmonia praestabilita* which is reflected by political harmony of a number of singular political existence constituting Reich.¹¹ Nevertheless, it seems that, though easy to be indicated, all references to the philosophical system of Leibniz should be treated cautiously for Leibniz proves the existence of the international legal subjectivity of the German states,¹² fighting simultaneously for the equal political status of the dukes and the German electors within the Empire.¹³ However, independently from his inconstancy of views on certain political issues, for Leibniz, undoubtedly, the Holy Roman Empire is the structure for which a better alternative can hardly be found. What is more, the structure is under the leadership of the emperor who is almost an immaculate ruler for Leibniz, which is illustrated by the portrait of Leopold I presented by the philosopher in his treatise *Mars Christianissimus*.¹⁴ The unquestionability of the authority of the emperor as the supreme secular power in the Empire and in Europe whose duty was to protect real faith, to rule the universal church and to develop the Christianity towards the highest virtue constitutes the content of the second point of *Unfforgreifffliche Gedancken*. While proving the significance of the principles constituting that community, Leibniz refers to it directly calling it the German Nation (**Die Teutsche Nation**).

At this stage a fundamental issue is being approached which demands a reference to the state of research regarding the beginnings of the formation of the German People's state. Critical literature reveals a view which claims that starting from XVIII Century till the twenties of XIX Century the existence of the German People's state cannot be discussed for that function was revealed neither by the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation nor by any territorial state it consisted of. Instead of the one state representing one nation, there were several states inhabited by people being at variance defined as **German communities**. This term is opposed to the term **German nation** in the contemporary meaning of the word.

¹¹ AA, IV, ii, p. 291.

¹² AA IV, ii, pp. 296–297.

¹³ See J. Sitniewska, *Jedność Europy, wspólnota kultury, interes państwa*, cited type-script, pp. 173–182.

¹⁴ AA, IV ii, p. 481.

Moreover, it was not identical with the imagination of what the Germans should be. Therefore, it is definitely stated that neither the German state nor the German nation as a political phenomenon really existed.¹⁵

A research regarding general problems of the nation reveals two approaches enabling the description of the processes constituting the formation of the nation. The first one is known as the "instrumentalistic" approach found in the works of Hans Kohn, Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm or Ernest Gellner. The second one is referred to as the "constructivistic" one and is revealed by the works of Frederick Barth and Abner Cohen.¹⁶ The "instrumentalistic" approach assumes that the formation of the notion of the nation is an ideological construct talking about the participation in the "unreal" community (as opposed by the "real" one) where feelings of a certain bond are being formed referring to the mutual language, symbols, etc. Eric J. Hobsbawm defines bounds of this type as **proto-national**.¹⁷ The "constructivistic" concept supplements the ideological conditioning discussed earlier by indicating in the human awareness the formation of boundaries in relation to other people, who are ethnically different, hence creating their own national identity.

Researchers argue that the issue of language, or more precisely, the existence of congenial variants (dialect) of German, was constitutive for **German communities** as a specific form of the existence of certain proto-national community. It was already in the Middle Ages that the words **German**, **a German**, as well as **Germans** appeared.¹⁸ Nevertheless, it is pointed out that those words signified a certain affiliation to the community referring mostly to the cultural phenomena. It is also highlighted that till the beginning of XIX Century those words did not reveal any political connotations. Some researchers claim that the use of those terms appeared on the ground of the intuitive feeling of some bonds between the people speaking

¹⁵ See T. Namowicz (ed.), *Państwo a społeczeństwo...*, op. cit., p. 17 and the reference of the literature there.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 17.

¹⁷ E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nationen und Nationalismus. Mythos und Realität seit 1780*, Frankfurt a. M 1991, p. 59 and following, cited after T. Namowicz (ed.), op. cit., p. 18.

¹⁸ *The Dictionary of the German Language* by Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm signifies the existence of those words already in the early Middle Ages but mainly in the form of an adjective, eg. **deutsche Sitte** (German custom), **deutsche Tracht** (German outfit). On the other hand, the noun **German** to signify the person belonging to the German community appeared much more later and was rather rarely used. The term **Deutschland** is the latest (more frequently used from XVI Century) which generally meant **das deutsche Volk** (nation/German peoples). This information is given T. Namowicz (ed), *Państwo a społeczeństwo...*, op. cit., pp. 18–19.

different dialects of the German language independently from the territories they inhabited. It also resulted from the need to define one's local as well as supra-regional identity in the situation of the fall of the Christian homogeneity of Europe and the creation of the states in the west of the continent which were emphasising their individual national character, especially France. Therefore, from the very beginning, the language was the main or even the exclusive element connecting people. As it is pointed by some researchers, other terms, which are generally used nowadays such as mutual territory, mutual historical experience, mutual state or religion are not consistent with the reality of the German communities both at the beginning of the modern era and in the later period.¹⁹

3. Language as a political project

It seems that all the above considerations, true in their general scheme, are difficult to preserve in a unitary perspective of the vision of the society, state and nation as presented by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. The philosopher proudly describes himself: I am German²⁰ and he makes the German character the basic foundation to raise the vision of the enlightened German society, the German nation, united in the framework of the conservative formula of the Empire, which, in his opinion, is consolidating the German individuality in Europe. That vision is presented by him in *Unvorgreifliche Gedancken*, and the vision concerns the community Leibniz calls the **German nation**.

Leibniz creates the idea of the German community by referring to the common historical experience, memories of the former power and the German courage and valiance.²¹ He points out common cultural output which is the outcome of the writers and poets writing in German. Leibniz also shows the achievements of the German legislation and cultural outcome of the reformation movement. One can also find a reference to the real Christian faith – Leibniz's peaceful attitude does not allow for the indication of its one and only form. Being a confessional Lutheran, he was serving his Catholic patrons for many years and the biggest part of his life was devoted to the matter of building the unity of the church through his deep engagement

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ AA IV, ii, p. 472.

²¹ UG, 2, 3.

into the reunion attempts.²² Finally, there is an element which is a necessary condition of the whole community’s autonomy, that is, the language which envelops the integrity of the historical, cultural and spiritual experiences recording the history of human discoveries.²³

Hence the philosopher notices and clearly qualifies all the conditions which ultimately define something that constitutes the essence of the idea of **nation**. It does not mean the real existence of the German nation in the modern sense of the term but Leibniz designs that nation. The reconstruction and modernisation of the German language is the beginning of that project. For Leibniz this is a matter of priority for it decides about the realisation of other matters connected with administration, legislation, science and culture uniting the German-speaking community into one national body.

As a researcher and an expert in the field of history, Leibniz frequently emphasises cultural individuality, which is illustrated by *Dissertatio de origine Germanorum* (1697) or his rich correspondence with Job Ludolf regarding the German language. The text *Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken* is not free from emotional and ideological features. While presenting the program of repairing and rebuilding of the language, first of all the philosopher highlights the insufficiency and defects which should be eliminated from the German language. He points out the lack of adequate terminology in many specialistic disciplines. Latin, the official language of science, is to blame in this case. However, Leibniz notices that it is not the lack of abilities of Germans but the lack of their goodwill that prevents them from perfecting the language. For if “everything that a plain man does can be expressed in German, undoubtedly, the things that are more suitable for remarkable and educated people, if they only wanted, could be expressed very well or even better in the pure German”.²⁴ It seems that Leibniz goes back here to the thought presented in a radical way in the *Introduction to Nizolius* where he argued that if something cannot be expressed in a colloquial language, it should be removed from philosophy. Similarly to *Introduction*, it is possible to notice certain incoherence in his views. Leibniz claims that in principle every language to the same degree corresponds to the needs of everyday life and adapts to the requirements of science. Advancement in science de-

²² See J. Sitniewska, *Jedność Europy, wspólnota kultury, interes państwa*, cited typescript, pp. 114–147.

²³ G. W. Leibniz, *New Essays on Human Understanding*, trans. P. Remnant, J. Bennet, 1969, Cambridge University Press, BK III, Ch. i, § 5.

²⁴ UG, 34.

depends on a clear and precise formulation of thoughts whose manifestation is best fulfilled in a native language. Therefore, it is not important whether philosophy is practised in English, German or French; it is only important that each of these languages follows the trace of our discoveries and reflects the inner order of thoughts in the best way. It appears that if Germans overcame psychological barriers, by perfecting the language they would be able to achieve success in every field. In the fight to strengthen the “spirit of the nation” that democratically sounding argument seemed too weak for Leibniz. Adopting rather publicistic than scientific style, Leibniz explains to his compatriots that none of the European languages is good enough as the German language is to formulate and verify different philosophical doctrines. He argues that this is because “We, Germans, have a strange standard of thoughts that others are not familiar with (...) and this is our language in itself for what can be expressed in it without borrowed, extraordinary words is something really reliable; the German language does not accept empty words that are not supported by anything but only by the foam of vain thoughts”.²⁵

Leibniz builds argumentation using his diplomatic and political skills. He refers to the all achievements of the Germans in the fields where they have achieved any success. He is aware of the fact that it is difficult to point out a significant scientific achievement for he notices that German scientists used Latin letting their native language take their course. Being the language of the uneducated majority, German could not develop properly.²⁶ To his mind, that majority achieved a high level of knowledge in such fields as mining, hunting, forestry, mechanics or navigation. This is to be proved by specialist vocabulary accepted by the languages of different nations.²⁷ Leibniz also recalls military victories Germans have participated into and writes that the nation that has given the evidence of courage and valiance is capable of the same effort in the intellectual field. This is possible due to the development of one’s own language.²⁸

Although Leibniz’s argumentation is emotional to some degree and slightly demagogic, it reveals a good deal of common sense for Leibniz behaves like a real psychologist making efforts to cure the German wretched spirit experienced by military misfortunes. He writes that among all, it was the Thirty Years War that put “our language in a similar state of chaos as

²⁵ UG, 11.

²⁶ UG, 25.

²⁷ UG, 9.

²⁸ UG, 4.

our homestead”,²⁹ whereas after its end Germany became dominated by the French power and elegance. However, Leibniz evaluates all foreign influences in a different manner than language purists do. He does see possible threats but he also highlights certain profits resulting from a mutual penetration of different cultures. It was from Italians, among all, that Germans had learnt how to prevent infectious illnesses and French people taught them how to improve military structures.³⁰ What is more, an intercourse with the French culture had given some easiness to a serious “German nature” and allowed for the change of their aesthetic likes and lifestyle. The language itself had also been enriched with the expressions which had entered the German language in a kind of natural manner like plants given a new ground.

Nevertheless, Leibniz is generally against a common use of any foreign language in everyday life as well as in any types of institutional life. He writes that it would be a never-ending pity and shame if our major language, the language of brave people, was to decline due to our carelessness.³¹ The common use of the language which is different from the national one, which is never acquired perfectly enough by everybody, also results in some chaos in the way of thinking. The one who does not know all the meanings of foreign words and expressions cannot write well and thinks erroneously for nothing good can result from the acceptance of a foreign language and, moreover, it brings a danger of losing one’s freedom.³² Making references to the materials and documents comprised in the emperor’s archives, Leibniz writes that their analysis allows for the observation of a gradual fall of the German language which used to reveal its purity at the times of Reformation. It is from the goodwill of scientific, ecclesiastic and educated elites that the introduction of the reparation program aiming at the restoration of the appropriate range of the German language depends on.³³

²⁹ UG, 25.

³⁰ UG, 27.

³¹ UG, 21.

³² UG, 20, 21. The main point made here is that the acquisition of a foreign language at the level of its skills *stricte* does not bring the same psychological and social causes. Rightly but not consequently, Leibniz notices that not everything which can be translated verbally is equivalent in the sphere of verbal behaviour connected with actions of sociological and cognitive character. The language, being at the grammatical or systematic level, separated from the semantic sphere of its vocabulary, which to a great extent reveals an extra-linguistic character, is not the tool of building a community whose interest is marked exclusively by the symbolism or dictionary adopted from outside.

³³ UG, 33.

4. Conclusion

A concern for the intellectual development of Germans connected with the actions for the protection and development of the whole cultural legacy of the German people present in *Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken* is the expression of the thinker's stand who builds the conditions and future of his compatriots on strong and rational premises. They are a common approach to knowledge, a new organization of the education system, improvement of administration, a modern way of recording the data and, above all, the protection and development of the language that Leibniz treats as the highest national property. The treatise is not the only text of Leibniz where he appears as a philosopher and a German patriot. He notices the dependence between the wealth of the nation and its education even as a young man while writing *Einige Patriotische Gedancken*,³⁴ where he postulates the introduction of the national language into the schools of the entire Empire. Interesting is the fact that it directly refers to the moral renovation of the whole German society which is to be guaranteed by a good grasp of the language for not only does it allow for the mastery of the art of reading, writing and counting but it also implants many virtues and respect to God in people.³⁵

Leibniz's project of the repairing and improvement of the language is a mature plan aimed at building the new enlightened German society aware of their value, potential and power reflected by the language echoing creative skills of its speakers. Although the plan was to be realized by the next century, it was done without any awareness of acting according to the ready made philosophical or political plan. As a "social engineer", Leibniz failed to come into being as the inspirer of concrete modernization acts in cultural and social spheres. The fact that the text *Unvorgreiffliche Gedancken* has been pigeon-holed to the philosophical output of the thinker resulted in a limited reception of a narrow group of receivers. Leibniz as a political thinker cast in his lot with Leibniz as a logician whose contributions in the development of logic and mathematics were to be discovered only in XX Century. A lack of understanding of his contemporaries along with the negligence of his descendants has resulted in the fact that Leibniz, instead of becoming the father of the modern German nation, has been placed in the consciousness of Germans as an esoteric philosopher.

³⁴ AA, IV, iii. 359–365.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

S U M M A R Y

The aim of the article is to present arguments to support the thesis that the text by G. W. Leibniz concerning the repair and improvement of the German language can be included in his works as a political thinker in the part where philosopher undertakes the absolutely fundamental issue of establishing the basis of modern German national community. The project of constructions of a new enlightened German society based on a firm linguistic foundation laid out in *Unforgreifliche Gedanken* is a mature thought underestimated political plan of the philosopher. Leibniz as a political thinker never became known in cultural and social circles as initiator of specific modernization actions. Including the text of treatise into the linguistic works of the philosopher was the reason of the limitation of its reception to a small audience. Leibniz – political thinker shared the fate of Leibniz – logician, whose contribution to the development of logic and mathematics was unraveled only by the 20th century. Incomprehension of his contemporaries and the oblivion of his posterity caused that even if Leibniz could become the father of the modern German nation, he has remained in its consciousness mainly as an esoteric philosopher.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Primary sources:

- AA** – Leibniz G. W. *Samtliche Schriften und Briefe*, 6 Reihen, Darmstadt 1923, Leipzig 1938, Berlin 1950.
- Leibniz G. W. *Caesarinus Fürsternerius*, in: G. W. Leibniz, *Political Writings*, ed. By P. Riley, Cambridge 1985.
- CE** – Leibniz G. W. *Collectanea Etymologica, illustrationi linguarum, veteris Celticae, Germanicae, Gallicae, aliarumque inservientia*, cum praefatione Johannis Georii Eccardi, Hanoverae 1717.
- Leibniz G. W. *New Essays on Human Understanding*, trans. P. Remnant, J. Bennet, Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- UG** – Leibniz G. W. *Unforgreifliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der Deutschen Sprache*, in CE.

Secondary sources:

- Chaunu P., *La civilisation de l'Europe des lumières*, B. Arthaud, Paris 1971.
- Hobsbawm E. J. *Nationen und Nationalismus. Mythos und Realität seit 1780*, Frankfurt a. M 1991.
- Namowicz T., *Państwo a społeczeństwo. Wizje wspólnot niemieckich od Oświecenia do okresu Restauracji*, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań 2007.
- Sitniewska J. *Jedność Europy, Wspólnota kultury, interes państwa. Dylematy myśli politycznej G. W. Leibniza*, Katowice 2005. Typescript.