

II, 1 (88:16). CA II, 6 (102:1-2).

95. Plato, *Timaeus* 28C. See also n. 32 above.

96. See *DP*, where Nicholas develops this theme of *possest*, Actualized-possibility.

97. See n. 17 above.

98. Here, at *VS* 13 (34:78), “Non igitur potest fieri quod ...” should be translated as “Therefore, it is not possible that” See n. 19 above.

99. “God’s creative power is not exhausted in His creation” *DP* 8:12-13.

100. “Solus deus est possest, quia est actu quod esse potest” [*VS* 13 (34:12-13)]. The expression “... est actu quod esse potest” is ambiguous. It can mean either “is actually that which can be” or “is actually that which He can be.” I use parentheses—here and elsewhere in the translation—to indicate that either sense (or both senses) may be intended by Nicholas. Cf. n. 21 above.

101. The theme of God as Not-other (*non-aliud*) intersects with the theme of God as Actualized-possibility (*possest*). It is not surprising that these two themes are placed in sequence in *VS* (viz., in *VS* 13 and 14).

102. However, as Nicholas makes clear, no two objects differ from each other in number alone. [See *DI* I, 3 (9) and II, 1 (91-94).] See the translated text marked by n. 194 below. Also see *DI* I, 17 (49:2). Leibniz later capitalized upon this same theme.

The foregoing Latin sentence [*VS* 13 (35:10-13)] needs to be repunctuated; and “*aut*” should not be added by the editor.

103. In Eternity (i.e., in God) there is no plurality. See n. 48 above. The plural mode of discourse (“you see *them* to be ...”) is but a *modus loquendi*.

104. Here, at *VS* 13 (36:5-10), the two Latin sentences (“*Nam ... aeternitas*”) require repunctuation. Regarding the translation of “*fieri possunt actu*” at 36:7-8, cf. 37:7-8.

105. *Compendium* 4 (8:16-17). I regularly translate “*multiplicabilis*”/“*multiplicabile*” as “replicable” or as “precisely replicable”; and I translate “*plurificabilis*”/“*plurificabile*” as “repeatable” or as “precisely repeatable.” In *Compendium* 4 and *VS* 22 (65) Nicholas means that no thing can be reproduced or can reproduce itself in such a way that the two things differ in number alone. Nicholas uses “*multiplicabilis*” and “*plurificabilis*” interchangeably, without a difference of meaning. When he uses both words together—at *VS* 38 (110:15-16)—he does so because of emphasis, not because of significance. Other such redundancies occur throughout *VS* (and his other works). Examples in *VS* include “*virtus seu potentia*” [21 (59:19)]; “*species seu forma*” [24 (72:6)]; “*pulchritudo sive species*” [24 (72:12)]; “*essentiae et quidditates*” [29 (86:8-9)]; “*creator et dator*” [29 (87:10)].

106. *DI* I, 5 (14:1-8).

107. See n. 63 above.

108. Nicholas is not here drawing any distinction between *monas*, *unum*, and *unitas*.

109. *De Aequalitate* 26:5-6. *VS* 22 (67:9-10). *Compendium* 11 (36:8). “*Quodlibet est vel non est*” may be acceptably translated either with or without the addition of the words “the case.”

110. The principles of non-contradiction and of excluded middle apply within the domain of the finite (*Ap.* 15). They do not apply to God, who, qua undifferentiated Being itself, is said to be that in which all differences coincide [*DC* II, 1 (78:13-