

THE DOWNFALL OF CARTESIANISM

1673-1712

II

RICHARD A. WATSON

THE DOWNFALL OF CARTESIANISM

1673-1712

A STUDY OF EPISTEMOLOGICAL ISSUES IN LATE

17TH CENTURY CARTESIANISM

Directors: P. Dibon (Nimeguen) and R. Popkin (University of California, San Diego)
Editorial Board: J. Collins (St. Louis Univ.); A. Crombie (Oxford); I. Dambaska (Cracow);
H. de la Fontaine-Verwey (Amsterdam); H. Gadamer (Heidelberg); H. Gouhier (Paris);
T. Gregory (Rome); T. E. Jessop (Hull); A. Koyré (Paris); P. O. Kristeller (Columbia
Univ.); S. Lindroth (Upsal); P. Mesnard (Tours); J. Orcibal (Paris); I. S. Revah (Paris);
G. Sebba (Emory Univ., Atlanta); R. Shackleton (Oxford); J. Tans (Groningen);
G. Tonelli (Pise)

Secretaries: P. Golliet (Nimeguen) and Elisabeth Labrousse (Paris)

RICHARD A. WATSON

Assistant Professor

Washington University

THE DOWNFALL OF CARTESIANISM
1673-1712

A STUDY OF EPISTEMOLOGICAL ISSUES IN LATE
17TH CENTURY CARTESIANISM



MARTINUS NIJHOFF - THE HAGUE - 1966

ISBN-13 978-90-247-0187-2 e-ISBN-13: 978-94-010-2963-6
DOI: 10.1007/978-94-010-2963-6

Copyright 1966 by Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Netherlands

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 1966

*All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to
reproduce this book or parts thereof in any form*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An earlier version of this book was written as a dissertation under the direction of Professor Richard H. Popkin, now Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at the University of California, San Diego. I have benefitted immensely from his knowledge of 17th century philosophy and his willingness to discuss the issues considered here. Popkin's major work, *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Descartes* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1960; revised edition, 1964) provides the necessary background for the present study.

Professors Harry M. Bracken of Arizona State University and Edwin B. Allaire of the University of Iowa have read the manuscript in several stages of completion; each has made valuable comments. I wish also to thank my professors at the University of Iowa, my fellow students there (now professors) Henry G. Van Leeuwen of Hanover College and Philip D. Cummins of the University of Iowa, my former colleagues at the University of Michigan, and my wife, all of whom have assisted me in the completion of this study. Further invaluable help has been provided by the secretarial staff of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Michigan and by many librarians of the following libraries: Library of the University of Iowa, Library of the University of Michigan, Niedersächsischen Landesbibliothek, Bibliothèque Nationale, Honnold Library of the Associated Colleges at Claremont, Hoose Library of Philosophy of the University of Southern California.

Permission has kindly been granted by the editors of the *Revue internationale de la philosophie* and the *Journal of the History of Philosophy* for the publication of material which has appeared in different form in their journals.

Research funds were supplied by a University of Michigan Horace H. Rackham Graduate School Summer Faculty Research Fellowship and Research Grant. Funds for typing the manuscript were provided by the Department of Philosophy at the University of Michigan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	
Introduction	1
A Characterization of a Scholastic Explanation of Perception and Knowing	5
The Development of the Distinction between Primary and Secondary Qualities before Descartes	8
II. SIMON FOUCHER	
Life and Works	13
His Academic Scepticism and his Positive Position	18
III. LATE 17TH CENTURY CARTESIAN METAPHYSICS AND CRITICISMS OF IT	
A Model Late 17th Century Cartesian Metaphysical System	29
Foucher's Major Criticisms of Cartesian Metaphysics	36
IV. THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING IDEAS BETWEEN MALEBRANCHE AND FOUCHER	
Foucher's Reading of the First Volume of the First Edition of Malebranche's <i>Recherche</i>	40
Foucher's Criticisms of the Malebranchian Way of Ideas	49
Malebranche's Response to Foucher and the Failure of the Malebranchian Way of Ideas	53
V. THE ORTHODOX (NON-OCCASIONALIST) CARTESIAN WAY OF IDEAS	
Robert Desgabets: The Orthodox Cartesian Suggestion of Non-resembling Representative Ideas	64
Foucher's Reply to Desgabets	68
Louis de La Forge: The Orthodox Cartesian Dependence upon God	70

Jacque Rohault: The Denial of the Causal Likeness Principle	73
Pierre-Sylvain Régis: The Dependence upon Inexplicable Causal Relations	75
Antoine Le Grand: Ideas as Nature's Signs	81
Antoine Arnauld: Representative Perceptions	85
VI. AN ANALYSIS OF THE CARTESIAN FAILURES TO SOLVE PROBLEMS FACING CARTESIANISM	89
Ideas as Natural Signs	90
The Mechanical Notion of Causation	95
External Ideas	98
Direct Acquaintance	101
The Cartesian Dependence upon the Likeness Principles and the Ontology of Substance and Modification	101
VII. POST-CARTESIAN DEVELOPMENTS OF THE WAY OF IDEAS	
Monistic Solutions to Cartesian Problems	105
John Locke	107
George Berkeley	111
David Hume	118
VIII. LEIBNIZ AND FOUCHER	
The Correspondence between Leibniz and Foucher Concerning First Principles, Certain Knowledge, and the External World	123
Leibniz's New System and Foucher's Criticisms of It	128
Leibniz's Notion of Matter	133
Leibniz's Solutions to Cartesian Problems	136
IX. CONCLUSION	143
<i>Appendix I.</i> A Table of the Principles of a Late 17th Century Cartesian Metaphysical System	147
<i>Appendix II.</i> A Schematic Outline of Foucher's Criticisms of Cartesianism	147
<i>Bibliography</i>	148
<i>Index of Names</i>	157