

SWEDENBORG AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY COSMOLOGY*

Francesca Maria Crasta†

In this essay we shall examine some of the historical-philosophical premises which, during the first half of the eighteenth century, formed the background for discussions on cosmology. We shall particularly dwell on Emanuel Swedenborg's cosmogonic system, profoundly influenced by the mechanistic Cartesian model. Swedenborg, who came into contact with the English Newtonian environment about 1710, attempted to mediate between vortex and universal gravitational physics. This attempt, though hardly convincing with regard to the mathematical definition of phenomena, is particularly interesting in relation to the evolutionistic cosmologic hypotheses formulated in the eighteenth century.

* * * * *

Historians of science generally agree that Newton's *Principia Mathematica* reflect a fundamentally static image of our planetary system. In fact, they refer us to the representation of an orderly world, sustained by regular, predictable movements, and similar to a large clockwork. In the "Elegantissima haecce Solis, Planetarum et Cometarum compages" which move, as Newton writes in the *Scolium Generale* of the *Principia*, in the emptiness of celestial space, we can recognize the hand of an "Entis intelligentis et potentis" presiding over the equilibrium of the universe.¹

The image of a world-clock and of a God-watchmaker is found, as we know, in many authors close to Newton, such as R. Bentley, S. Clarke, W. Whiston, G. Cheyne and W. Derham,² who successfully adapted it to the

* This study is a corrected and completed version of *Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Cosmology*, published in "Memorie della Società Astronomica Italiana," 1989, vol. 60, n. 4, pp. 823-836.

† Francesca M. Crasta, a researcher in the Institute of Philosophy at the University of Cagliari, has studied medieval and eighteenth-century cosmological problems. She is currently working on a monography on Swedenborg's philosophy of nature and has published the following regarding this author: *Il problema dei punti metafisici: il contributo di Emanuel Swedenborg*, *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari*, vol. IX/X (XLVI-XLVII), 1988-1989.

Newtonian gravitational model. In such a representation, any prospect of developing a new world system in an evolutionistic sense evidently vanished. Newtonian celestial mechanics had in fact established the laws governing the movements of bodies in the solar system after creation with mathematical rigor and Newton himself had clearly stated that one could not explain the primitive, regular position of the orbits of the planets and satellites around the Sun by using gravitational laws:

Perseverabunt quidem in orbibus suis per leges gravitatis, sed regularem orbium situm primitus acquirere per leges hasce minime potuerunt.³

For Newton, investigating the origins and the past of the planetary order would have meant renouncing the story of *Genesis* and letting himself be tempted by the ambitious yet inconclusive project of “fabricare” the world “à la Descartes.” The Newtonian cosmos thus has no beginning or history. One scarcely glimpses the eventuality that the system can rejuvenate” due to the passage of a comet whose vapours could contribute “for the Refreshment and Recruit of the Sun or some of its Planets”, as William Derham wrote in the *Astro-Theology*, referring directly to Newton.⁴

Simon Schaffer⁵ has rightly stressed how difficult it is for the historian to single out the numerous steps and continual integrations which led from the static cosmologic model imposed by Newtonian celestial mechanics at the beginning of the eighteenth century to the evolutionistic model, whose birth is generally dated from the publication of Buffon’s first three volumes of the *Histoire Naturelle* in 1749. The evolutionary hypothesis advanced by the first volume of the *Histoire*, dedicated to the history of the Earth, will, as we know, resound and be significantly developed in the cosmologic theories of Kant, Lambert, Laplace and Herschel.

The propositions and theorems of the *Principia Mathematica* surely constituted a successful alternative to Cartesian vortex physics; however, they undoubtedly left little space for those ideas of chances and transformations in natural structures which were being clearly defined in various research sectors. These perspectives were however effectively expressed in the widespread cosmo-geologic literature which flourished

between the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the new century⁶ (it is sufficient to recall the success of authors like Th. Burnet, J. Woodward and W. Whiston) and in the “sparkling” prose of Fontenelle’s *Entretiens*, which spread the image of a nature all life and movement during much of the eighteenth century.⁷ On the other hand, Leibniz (and in this specific context we refer especially to the *Protogaea*) also accepted the idea of a history of nature made up of revolutions and changes.⁸ We must remember that these tendencies intersected and were confused with the vision of a fertile “plastic nature” animated by vital forces and spirits which the rich Neoplatonic tradition had repropounded in the Renaissance, and the Cambridge school had renewed toward the end of the seventeenth century. In short, it is certainly not necessary to wait for the article *Cosmogonie*,⁹ edited by D’Alembert and published in the first volume of the *Encyclopedie* to understand that the cosmology of the fifth part of the *Discours sur la Methode*, of the *Principia Philosophiae* and of *Le Monde* had not been completely set aside during the Age of Enlightenment. In Cartesian cosmology, hinging on the mechanism of vortex of fluid material which pull planetary bodies by their continual movement, was the fantastic, seductive description of a world undergoing continual development and transformation and subject to an incessant process of destruction and reconstruction.

We do not wish to tackle the thorny problem of the role played by Cartesian mechanics in Enlightenment culture, a role diversely and authoritatively interpreted in the works of A. Vartanian,¹⁰ P. Mouy,¹¹ E. J. Aiton¹² and others. It does however seem useful to stress once more the influence, decisive in many respects, exercised by the vortex theory on modern cosmogonic hypotheses. But the search for links and eventual relationships between Descartes’s “tourbillons” and modern hypotheses on the origin of the cosmos and stellar system, forces us to dwell on that period in the history of science defined by Pierre Busco as “crise du problème cosmogonique.”¹³ This period, from the publication of Newton’s *Principia* to the appearance of Buffon’s *Histoire Naturelle*, coincided with the culminating moments of the affirmation and diffusion of Newtonian gravitational theory in Europe. Those were the years in which the interest of the philosophers and naturalists was almost completely absorbed by discussions on the cause and nature of gravity. This debate was also fueled

by tenacious resistance of the “nouveaux cartésiens”; they were ready to pay any price on the level of physico-mathematical expedients and artifices in the vain attempt to save the vortex theory from definitive oblivion and check the success of the new physics,¹⁴ bolstered as it was, not only in astronomy, by ever-increasing experimental confirmation and verification.

The rigor of the demonstrations and experiments and the very weight of Newton’s authority (“a winner” in mathematics, mechanics and optics) seemed to have effectively succeeded in pushing cosmologic problems to the background to the point of nearly shifting them from the specific field of scientific treatment to the broader and more indefinite field of literary “otia.”

* * * * *

One of the rare exceptions to this type of “prohibitionism” regarding cosmology is the hypothesis on the origin of the solar system formulated by Emanuel Swedenborg, who published his *Opera Philosophica et Mineralia* in 1734.¹⁵ The first volume of this three-volume work presents the ambitious project of describing the “true system of the world” and includes an original cosmogonic model, born under the prevalent auspices of Cartesian mechanics and buried under the weight of a wearisome Latin prose. The work brought its author considerable fame as a mineralogist, as the second and third volumes are respectively a study of iron and copper; however, Swedenborg’s *Principia* was listed in the *Index Expurgatorius* in 1739, the same fate awaiting the first three volumes of Buffon’s *Histoire Naturelle* in 1751. The partially parallel destiny of these two works can be explained by the fact that, in spite of their considerable differences, a type of affinity links them in the fertile wake of materialism and Cartesian mechanics. Both are cosmogonical novels, as Buffon’s work will be called in the “*Journal de Savants*” of 1779, and both attempt to elaborate a rational cosmology that can reconstruct, beginning from primordial chaos, the ideal genesis of a cosmos being organized and ordered only on the basis of natural laws.

In the light of these rapid considerations, perhaps it is useful to dwell on Swedenborg’s cosmology. Despite his fame as primarily a mystic and

visionary, acquired in part due to fulminating Kantian sarcasm,¹⁶ he began his career with a vast, varied scientific production which we are currently investigating. Swedenborg's cosmologic hypothesis is rarely mentioned by historians of science and is generally little studied and almost forgotten, like other no less significant aspects of his work as a naturalist; his cosmologic hypothesis has been paradoxically compared to that of Kant, surely the leading, most authoritative detractor of the meek, hieratic Swedish metallurgist. Swedenborg's name is indeed cited in regard to the so-called Kant-Laplace nebular hypothesis in some histories of cosmology and in studies that have numbered him, often hastily, among the "fore-runners" of the modern evolutionistic model of the universe. Wishing to avoid the risks inherent in this type of historiographic perspective, we shall not consider here the possible influences, controversial and open to different evaluations, of Swedenborg's cosmology on Kant's *Naturgeschichte*.¹⁷ However, it seemed useful to call attention to the specific context of cosmogonic hypothesis of the *Principia Rerum Naturalium*, in an attempt to give it more space than it has previously had in the panorama of natural philosophy of the first half of the eighteenth century and free it from the burden, perhaps excessive, inevitably placed on it by Swedenborg's successive life experiences.

The main lines of Swedenborg's cosmologic hypothesis, which is not motivated by "Neocartesian" vindications in regard to Newton, whom Swedenborg says he fervently admires, can be rapidly summarized as follow:

1. the bodies of our planetary system originated from solar matter or chaos;
2. planetary masses gradually moved away from the Sun with a progressively slowing rotation speed until they reached their respective positions of equilibrium within the vortex to which they belong;
3. the Milky Way is the common axis or "vinculum" of a system of Sun-stars;
4. several stellar systems exist in sidereal space.

Two different metaphysical assumptions are the foundation for this cosmologic model, which at first glance seems to have vast, varying

relations, from Descartes to Buffon, Wright, Kant, Lambert and Laplace. The first assumption is that the universe in all its components is “ab infinitum productum” and therefore the long series of “finites” making up the world around us is derived from the infinite by means of a complex natural mechanism.¹⁸ The second establishes that nature is always similar to itself and therefore there is only a quantitative difference between small (microcosm) and large (macrocosm) structures:

Nature is always the same, and always maintains the highest similarity to herself. If in least things she is most perfectly geometrical, so also is she in the greatest. That which in a smaller form is most perfect generates nothing dissimilar to itself, and consequently there is nothing dissimilar to it in the larger (*Principia*, Clissold, vol. II, p.229).

(Natura sibi semper eadem et simillima est: si in minimis perfectissime geometrica sit, est etiam in maximis perfectissime geometrica: quod perfectissimum in minori est, non dissimile parit, nec dissimile est in majori[...]) (*Principia*, vol. I, pars III, p.375).

The first substantial or first finite material derives from the infinite, or better, from its first product or “primum ens”; this tiny particle is destined to give origin to the second finite by means of its perpetual movement describing a spatial spiral. This second finite in turn produces the third which generates the fourth and then the fifth and sixth, in a process of derivation and development of forms and movements which finally constitute the first natural elements. Swedenborg numbers among the elements the universal one filling all sidereal space, as well as the magnetic, ethereal, aerial and aqueous ones. All these elements contribute to the successive birth of the three kingdoms into which the nature of our planet is divided, formed in the course of time through a long chain of mutations and transformations:

That no world can exist, abounding in any variety of objects and phenomena, without first passing through a succession of states and of intervals of time, through a succession of changes and contingencies;

through modes or modifications, through series of things successive, simultaneous and coexisting, likewise through connexions of series; as also iterated separations and connexions; whence arises the perfection of its compositions (Principia, Clissold, vol. II, pp.241-242).

(Quod mundus, qui varietate aspectabilis sit et phaenomenis abundet, dari nequeat, nisi successive et per temporis intervalla oriatur; et quod per vices et contingentia; per modos sive modificationes; per rerum successivarum, simultanearum et coexistentium series, perque serierum connexiones, et iterum separationes, et connexiones, sicque oriundas rerum compositiones perficiatur.) (Principia, vol. I, pars III, 1 pp. 381-382).

The origin of the planetary system and its vortex dates back to the formation of the fourth generation of particles or “fourth finites” which, increasing in number, are welded together and finally cover the Sun’s mass. The enormous solar vortex, formed from the particles of the magnetic element, is virtually empty, writes Swedenborg, in the sense that it is an “oceanus” of constantly flowing solar material completely devoid of planets, satellites and comets.¹⁹

All the principles of things to be successively produced are latent in solar space, inside a very dense cloud in constant rotary motion which nearly forms a crust. The first stage of the evolution of matter is determined by the progressive removal and consequent thinning, due to centrifugal motion, of the solar covering or crust, which begins to split, partially due to the internal pressure exerted by the Sun’s mass. The split, fractured crust collapses on its equatorial plane and finally surrounds the Sun, circling it like a great band or ring. In turn, due to rapid rotary motion, the ring moves progressively away from the Sun-centre, becomes thinner and finally breaks into parts which, sticking together in spheroidic masses of varying size, give rise to the planets and satellites of our system. These bodies continue to migrate towards the periphery of the vortex until they reach their respective positions of equilibrium within their various orbits. Swedenborg maintains that there are thousands of Suns-stars in the universe, of which the solar vortex, reflecting on a large scale the structures of the simplest elementary particle composed of an active nucleus

and a periphery of passive or “finite” elements, is only a tiny part:

Possibly there may be innumerable other spheres, and innumerable other heavens similar to those we behold; so many indeed and so mighty, that our own may be respectively only a point; for all the heavens, however multitudinous, however vast, yet being but finite, and consequently having their bounds, do not amount to a point in comparison with the infinite. Consequently if all the spheres, if all the heavenly hosts are even a point in respect to the infinite; if the whole visible sidereal expanse, which to our eye appears so immense, be only as a point in relation to the finite universe[...] (*Principia*, Clissold, vol. II, p.238-239).

([...]innumerae sphaerae et tales coeli dari possunt; et tot tantaeque fortassis, ut coelum hoc sit modo respectivo punctum: sunt enim omnes coeli simul, quanti quantique sint, quia finiti et limitati, ne quidem punctulum in respectu ad infinitum. Si ergo omnes sphaerae aut exercitus coelorum, ne quidem punctulum sint in respectu ad infinitum; et totum nostrum coram oculis tam immensum apparens coelum siderereum, tanquam punctum ad universum finitum[...]) (*Principia*, vol. I, pars III, 11, p. 380).

There are in fact innumerable stellar vortexes along the axis of the Milky Way where stars appear to be particularly concentrated.²⁰ For Swedenborg, as for Th. Wright in 1750,²¹ other stellar systems besides our galaxy exist in sidereal space, disseminated according to an order which repeats that of the smallest and simplest elementary particle expanded an infinite number of times. Swedenborg writes that the play of forces and the “gyratio spiralis” of the magnet offer us a model or representation of the whole cosmic structure on a reduced scale adequate to our sense.

Each star represents an active centre determining with its movement that of the respective vortex in which the life of planets and satellites originates and is consumed. The universe, a contiguous whole in constant movement and transformation, is perfected by vicissitudes and changes through the centuries; the more modifications it undergoes, the more

perfect it will be:

Hence the perfection of the world consists in its varieties; and inasmuch as variety cannot exist except by means of changes, it follows, that the world is brought progressively to its perfection by means of various changes, contingents, modifications, series of things, and their several connections (*Principia*, Clissold, vol. II, pp. 243-244).

([...].hinc in rerum varietate consistit ejus perfectio; et quia varietas non nisi per vices oriri potest, hinc per vices et contingentia, per modificationes, perque series rerum, illarumque varias connexiones magis magisque perficitur mundus.) (*Principia*, vol. I, pars III, 1, pp. 382-383).

“Sine contiguo nec foret mundus, nec ejus mechanismus”²² i. e., nothing can be conceived except in contiguity or connection; even the smallest movement or alteration occurring within a vortex is reflected on and perceived by the entire structure through a very long series of chain reactions:

The vortices in connexion with each other are only parts; parts preserve the connexion: if one part be deficient, there is a corresponding deficiency in the connexion: if one link in a chain be removed, lengthened, or curtailed, all the links of the chain alter their position: if one link be moved from its place, the whole chain is moved with it; for taken collectively they form one contiguous body: all the parts taken together originate the contiguity (*Principia*, Clissold, vol. II, pp. 238).

(Mutuo enim connexi vortices, prout illi circumcirca magnetem, esse videntur: in nexu subsistit sphaera. Ipsi vortices in nexu sunt partes; partes conservant unice nexum; deficiente una, aliquid in nexu deficit; si unum catenae auferas, prolonges aut decurtes, omnes unci totius catenae se illico applicabunt; si unum ejus unum loco moves, totam catenam e loco movebis; simul enim contiguum formant; omnes partes simul sumtae sistunt illam con-

tiguitatem.) (*Principia*, vol. I, pars III, 9, p. 380).

On the basis of these necessarily rapid observations, it is impossible to fully evaluate the affinities and divergences between Swedenborg's cosmology and those elaborated after the mid-seventeenth century. It is not even possible to determine the role actually played by the cosmologic hypothesis of the *Principia Rerum Naturalium* immediately after their publication; from now on, however, it seems opportune to reconsider Stanley Jaki's affirmation in *Planets and Planetarians* that excludes the possibility that Swedenborg's cosmogonic hypothesis could have somehow "contaminated" the French environment.²³ Buffon, who shared among other things Swedenborg's interest in minerals and mining activities, was almost certainly acquainted with *Principia*; at American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing in New York there is a copy of Swedenborg's treatise with the French naturalist's autograph on the title-page and the date 1736. But aside from these considerations, which require more careful, closer comparison, it is sufficient here to simply note the fact that before 1749 an evolutionistic or transformist cosmology presenting remarkable aspects as compared to the Cartesian one was already available. We are in fact confronted with a cosmologic model which is surely more complex and less "grossier" than the one offered by the mechanics of bumps, thrusts, rubbings and aggregations on which Descartes constructed his world. The pages of Swedenborg's *Principia* substitute the dynamic concept of matter which is force, activity and movement (derived from Leibniz-Wolff) for the Cartesian concept of matter understood as a passive, inert entity. For Swedenborg, as for Wolff, nature is a set of mutations and, as for Leibniz, natural mutations derive from an internal principle, from a force inherent in the matter itself which pushes it, almost forcing it to continually modify and transform itself.

But here Swedenborg's thought is complicated by other motifs and embraces complex metaphysical problematics which it does not seem opportune to penetrate.²⁴ □

NOTES

1 Cf. Isaac Newton, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, in Isaaci Newtoni, *Opera Quae Exstant Omnia*, ed. by S. Horsley, London, J. Nichols, 1779-1785, vol.III, p.171.

2 On the subject, cf. P. Casini, *L'universo macchina*, Bari, Laterza, 1969.

3 Cf. Isaac Newton, *op.cit.*, p. 171.

4 Cf. William Derham, *Astro-Theology*, W. Innys, London, 1731, p. 164.

5 Cf. Simon Schaffer, *The Phoenix of Nature: Fire and Evolutionary Cosmology in Wright and Kant*, "Journal for the History of Astronomy," 9, 3, 1978, pp. 180-200.

6 Of the vast literature on the subject, we indicate only: K.B. Collier, *Cosmogonies of Ours Fathers. Some Theories of the 17th and 18th Centuries*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1934; M.H. Nicolson, *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory*, The Norton Library, New York, 1959; Idem, *The Breaking of the Circle*, New York, 1965; Ch.C. Gillispie, *Genesis and Geology*, Harper, New York, 1959; G.L. Davies, *The Earth in Decay. A History of British Geomorphology: 1578-1878*, Macdonald, London, 1968; P. Rossi, *I segni del tempo: storia della Terra e storia delle nazioni*, Feltrinelli, Milano, 1979; S.J. Gould, *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle: Myth and Metaphor in the Discovery of Geological Time*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass.), 1987.

7 Cf. M.T. Marcialis, *Fontenelle, un filosofo mondano*, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filosofia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari, Sassari, 1978, cap. III, pp. 224-242.

8 On the subject, cf. Giovanni Solinas, *La "Protogaea" di Leibniz ai margini della rivoluzione scientifica*, in *Saggi sull'illuminismo*, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filosofia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari, 1973, pp. 9-69.

9 The article affirms the liberty to say: "...avec Descartes, que les planetes, et la terre en particulier, ont commencé par être des soleils qui se sont ensuit encroûtés..." and that therefore: "Il doit être permis de dire que la formation de ce Monde n'a dépendu que du mouvement et de la matiere différemment combinés...", cf. *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire Raisonné des Sciences des Arts et des Métiers*, Paris, M.DCC.LIV, tome quatrième, p. 293.

10 Cf. A. Vartanian, *Diderot et Descartes. A Study of Scientific Naturalism in the Enlightenment*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1953.

11 P. Mouy, *Le développement de la physique cartésienne 1646-1712*, J. Vrin, Paris, 1934.

12 E.J. Aiton, *The Vortex Theory of Planetary Motions*, Macdonald, London-New York, 1972.

13 Cf. P. Busco, *Les cosmogonies modernes et la théorie de la connaissance*, F. Alcan, Paris, 1924, p. 49 sgg..

14 On the debate between Cartesians and Newtonians, beside the works already quoted, see: P. Brunet, *L'introduction des théories de Newton en France au XVIII siècle*, A. Blanchard, Paris, 1931.

15 Cf. Emanuelis Swedenborgii, *Opera Philosophica et Mineralia*, vol. III, Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1734.

16 Cf. I. Kant, *Träume eines Geistersehers, erläutert durch Träume der Metaphysik*, Königsberg, 1766, in *Kant's Werke*, Band II, Berlin, 1912, pp. 315-368.

17 Cf. E. Adickes, *Kant als Naturforscher*, Berlin, 1924, vol. II, p. 294 sgg.; G. Tonelli, *Elementi metodologici e metafisici in Kant dal 1745 al 1768*, Torino, 1959, p. 49 sgg.; P. Casini, *Newton e la coscienza europea*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 1983, p. 119.

18 Nature's derivation out of Infinity comes from the first natural point that for Swedenborg represents the "medium" between an Infinity that is completely incomprehensible for the human mind, and the finite world which is ruled by the laws of geometry.

19 Cf. Emanuelis Swedenborgii, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pars I, par. X, p. 119.

20 Cf. Idem, par. I, p. 375 sgg..

21 Cf. Thomas Wright of Durham, *An Original Theory or New Hypothesis of the Universe*, facsimile reprint with introduction by M.A. Hoskin, Macdonald, London-New York, 1971.

22 Cf. Emanuelis Swdenborgii, *op. cit.*, vol. I, par. I, p. 12.

23 Cf. Stanley L. Jaki, *Planets and Planetarians: a History of Theories of the Origin of Planetary Systems*, Scottish Academic Press, Edinburgh, 1978, p. 79.

24 As regards the metaphysical implications of Swedenborg's philosophy of nature we refer to our: *La teoria dei punti metafisici: il contributo di Emanuel Swedenborg*, in the process of being published in *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Cagliari*, vol. IX/X (XLVI-XLVII), 1988-89.

