

On Force in Cartesian Physics*

John Byron Manchak

June 28, 2007

Abstract

There does not seem to be a consistent way to ground the concept of “force” in Cartesian first principles. In this paper, I examine various attempts at this. I argue that each attempt (as presented) carries with it unavoidable problems that undermine its feasibility. Next, I offer an alternative interpretation of force—one that I believe is coherent and consistent with Descartes’ project. Not only does the new position avoid the problems of previous interpretations, but it does so in such a way as to support and justify those previous interpretations.

1 Introduction

Before one can understand the particulars of Descartes’ physics, one must be familiar with his more general project. He held that when one begins “applying oneself to the true philosophy in earnest” one discovers that “all philosophy is like a tree, whose roots are metaphysics, whose trunk is physics, and whose branches, which grow from this trunk, are all of the other sciences.”¹

Cartesian metaphysics concerns what he terms the “principles of knowledge.” Though various lists consisting of these principles may be disputed, any catalog must (at least) include the ideas of God, self, and extension (Nelson 1997, 166). These principles can be clearly and distinctly perceived and it is upon these first principles that other principles rest (AT VI, 40). Thus, it must be possible to connect back (ground) the truths of physics (or any other truths for that matter) to one or more of these first principles. This connecting back of all knowledge to metaphysical principles is the general

*I am very grateful for Alan Nelson and our many discussions on this topic.

¹Descartes in Adams and Tannery (hereafter AT) IXB, 14.

project of Descartes and that which has been criticized for its inconsistency even in the most sympathetic literature (see Nelson 1997, 163).

The notion of “force” in Cartesian physics proves problematic. Force is unmistakably identified as the “power which all bodies have to act on, or resist, other bodies” (AT VIII A, 66). But Descartes is also committed to the position that bodies are simply the objects of geometry made real (see Garber 1992, 63-64). In other words, bodies (and thus force, it seems) must be connected back to the principle idea of extension. However, it is unclear how the notion of force (and its associated tendencies) fits into Descartes’ limited geometrical ontology.

In this paper, I will outline the previous proposals to understand Cartesian force along with the virtues associated with them. I will also argue that each attempt (as presented) carries with it unavoidable problems that undermine its feasibility. None of the theories qualify as a “satisfactory view of the ontology of force in Descartes, one that is coherent and sensible, and is consistent with what he says about force in all of his writings and what he commits himself to in other contexts” (Garber 1992, 297). Next, I will offer an alternative interpretation of force—one that I believe is coherent and consistent with Descartes’ project. I hope to show that not only does the new interpretation avoid the problems faced by the previous commentators, but that it also explains why they viewed Cartesian force as they did.

2 Previous Interpretations

Before considering each of the previous interpretations, we first examine in more detail the problems associated with a naive attempt to ground force in extension. A comparison of two articles of Descartes’ *Principles of Philosophy* reveals the apparent contradiction. The first relates the position that all of physics can be described geometrically:

The only principles which I accept, or require, in physics are those of geometry and pure mathematics; these principles explain all natural phenomena, and enable us to provide quite certain demonstrations regarding them (AT VIII A, 78).

The next bit of text consists in Descartes’ third law of nature. While outlining the conservation of quantity of motion, there is explicit mention of the motion which one body “imparts to the other body” (AT VIII A, 65).

Taken together, the two texts seem to be at odds because the “imparting of motion” (made possible by the “force” or “power” within the body) is

not a geometrical notion (AT VIII A, 66). One may argue that while the *effects* of the imparted motion may be geometrically described (by taking measurements of positions at different times, for example), the imparting of motion itself is not the sort of thing one can explain in terms of “matter (extended substance) in motion (where this motion is described kinematically)” (Hatfield [1979] 1998, 281). Thus, an alternate account of force is required.

2.1 God as the Locus of Force

It was Gary Hatfield’s view that by carefully attending to Descartes’ metaphysics, one must conclude that the source of any motion of matter (force) must be attributed to God ([1979] 1998, 288). This view was adopted in response to the inconsistencies of the naive attempt to ground force in the first principle of extension as presented in Richard Westfall’s (1971) account of 17th century force.

Hatfield begins with a discussion of matter and motion. The essence of matter (substance) is to be found in the first principle of extension (AT VIII A, 25). Motion, on the other hand, “is a mode of the mobile thing” and therefore “not a substance” (AT VIII A, 54). In other words, motion carries with it no reality outside the thing that it is moving. Thus “as long as the discussion is limited to matter and motion, it need be concerned only with things that are definable geometrically” (Hatfield [1979] 1998, 290).

For Hatfield, it seems natural to next try to understand the cause of the motion in matter. Descartes identifies the general cause and preserver of motion in bodies as God. But how is this idea of God as creator and preserver of motion or rest in extended bodies connected back to the concept of force? It is in Descartes’ third law that the transfer of motion between bodies (governed by force) is discussed. The proof which Descartes gives for the part of the third law that deals with transfers of motion rests on the immutability of God (AT VIII A, 66).

Hatfield argues that because force is grounded upon the immutability of God, God must be responsible for the force that governs the transfer of motion between bodies (i.e. it is God that actually transfers the motion between the bodies) ([1979] 1998, 295-6.) And so God’s continual imparting of motion (or rest) to matter is the “reality, the force or power, behind that mode of body which is called motion” (Hatfield [1979], 300). In other words, God (which was earlier identified as the cause of motion in matter) is now also identified as force.

Certainly, this interpretation is superior to the naive approach of ground-

ing force in extension. If force (and the associated tendencies of bodies) are grounded in God instead, the problem of finding some sort of geometrical interpretation for them dissolves: forces are not in bodies and are therefore in need of no such geometrical interpretation. However, the Hatfield interpretation is not free of difficulties.

The problems of this interpretation come in two kinds. The first is a gap in his argument. To say that God is “responsible” for the force that governs the transfer of motion between bodies is one thing (in fact, this claim is nicely supported with textual evidence). However, to say that this implies that God *is* the force that governs the transfer of motion between bodies is quite another thing. Could it not be that God is responsible for force in the sense that he endows the bodies with force at each moment (in accordance with the conservation of quantity of motion) and yet is not identified as the force itself?

The second (and more serious) kind of problem is in texts that seem to contradict his interpretation. The third law explicitly speaks of “the force of...bodies” [*la force de...corps*] (AT IXB, 88). Does Hatfield really want to defend to position that a force “of” a body is “in” God and not “in” the body? I agree with Garber in that I feel it “absurd to say that it is God himself who *has* the force for proceeding or force of resisting that appear as parameters in a particular case of collision” (1992, 294).

2.2 Force in Both God and Matter

It was Martial Gueroult’s view that Cartesian physics (and therefore force as well) rested on both extension (as matter and motion geometrically defined as a mode) *and* on God (as the cause of the existence of the matter and its modes) (1980, 200-1).

In arguing for his position, Gueroult notes first that Descartes’ physics deals not only with the “true and real beings” one finds in mathematics but also with physical bodies that are “actual and existent” (see Gueroult 1980, 196; AT V, 160). The principle of actuality and existence is, of course, God. The “creative force” of God is what distinguishes the extension as possibly existing and extension as actually existing. Thus, any discussion of force must be necessarily be tied back to the first principle of God.

For Gueroult, motion and rest (defined geometrically) are modes of extension but the force (of motion or of rest) is the “power that makes a thing with such a mode exist” (1980, 198). It seems that, for Gueroult, force and the attributes of duration and existence are all identified as one and the same thing and immutably express God’s creative action.

However, Gueroult does not (like Hatfield) only locate force in God. Characteristic of forces is that they are “immanent in ‘nature’ or extension and...can be calculated at each instant for each body” (Gueroult, 1980, 198). Immediately, a paradox presents itself. If forces are actually “in” bodies, they can be only extension and motion understood geometrically. Yet this contradicts what Gueroult has said concerning God (to whom forces should be “referred”). Gueroult finds his way out of the paradox by distinguishing between force as a cause and the effects of the forces (motion or rest as modes of extension). It is the effects of the forces (not the forces themselves) that are found “in” bodies and can be calculated. He explains his complex interpretation:

Consequently, we can see that physics must rest on two quite different foundations: on extended substance and motion geometrically defined as a mode...and on God as the sole power capable of creating matter, in short as the cause of extended substance and its modes (Gueroult 1980, 198).

Gueroult’s position is very appealing and certainly “quite ingenious” (Garber 1992, 295). In many ways, it seems to be an extension of Hatfield’s interpretation without the undesirable result of God being “in” bodies. Force can be understood as being grounded in God (as the creative force allowing the existence and duration of motion or rest) and yet the calculable effects of force can be immanent in extended substance.

The interpretation carries with it its own problems, however. There is no explanation of how, if force really is identified with the attributes of existence and duration in a body (stemming from the invariable nature of God), the calculable forces in a body can vary—having one value at one time and another value at another (see Garber 1992, 296).

Gabbey represents his position as an extension of Gueroult’s. He holds (like Gueroult) that the ontological status of force is complex and is grounded both in extension *and* God: forces “are in created substances as the effects of God’s creative and conserving activity” (Gabbey 1980, 234).

He also recognizes the problem outlined above of the variable nature of force that is not accounted for in Gueroult’s interpretation. To circumvent the difficulty, Gabbey suggests that there is a sense in which force can be thought of as a mode of extension (and therefore variable in nature). He explains: “Forces as *causae secundum fieri* are clearly in body *diverso modo*, so they are modes of body, rather than attributes” (Gabbey 1980, 237).

Of course, this takes care of the problem of the variable nature of calculable force, but in turn, it recreates the complications of the naive approach

to grounding force in extension. If there is a sense in which forces are in bodies, “what becomes of Descartes’ commitment to the position that everything in body must be conceived [only] as a mode of extended substance?” (Garber 1992, 297). Certainly Gabbey’s position that force be ultimately grounded in God does not square well with this commitment.

2.3 Force as Explanatory Construct

The difficulties associated with the foregoing positions led Daniel Garber to an altogether different type of interpretation. Instead of trying to ground the concept of force in first principles, Garber argues that force has no ontological status and is simply a “way of talking” about God’s creative and preserving activities (1992, 298). On this interpretation, God is the cause and preserver of motion in extended substance. There is “no need to attribute some new kind of property to bodies” (Garber 1992, 298). And so, when force enters the discussion (as it does in law three), it is only as “shorthand” description of the lawlike way in which God governs the interactions between bodies (see Slowik 2002, 58).

Garber’s interpretation certainly takes care of the ontological status of force. If force is merely a shorthand for God’s creative and preserving activities, many of the worries of Hatfield and Gueroult simply dissolve away. On this interpretation, there are no difficulties with Descartes’ force because there is no force!

But, this is not to say the theory is without its own problems. Garber claims that the only serious drawback to this approach is that the view is “not found in Descartes in any explicit way” (1992, 298). But this, I believe, is not the extent of difficulties. It seems to be quite a task to explain why, if there is “no need” to attribute the property of force to a body (as Garber holds), Descartes did so. Why insist that Descartes’ discussion of force means something other than “force”? Why not take Descartes at his word?

3 Alternative Interpretation

Given the problems of each interpretation, it may seem as though there isn’t a consistent and coherent way to understand force in Cartesian physics. I believe there is and I believe the key to constructing such a theory lies in considering force within a much larger interpretation of Cartesian ontology (for a general overview, see Nelson 1997). This interpretation of Descartes’ ontology has been nicely developed by Alice Sowaal (2004, 2005) and Lawrence Nolan (1997). In the next section, I will briefly outline their

positions. Then, I will specify how I believe the concept of force fits within this framework. Finally, I will show how such an understanding of force resolves the difficulties recounted in the previous interpretations.

3.1 Theory of Attributes

For Sowaal, there are three categories of things answering to the label “substance” within Cartesian ontology (2004, 222-227). Descartes defines substance in terms of independence and therefore God (the first or primary substance) and extended substance make up two categories (AT VIII A, 24). But Sowaal further divides the category of extended substance. For her, there is the secondary substance *res extensa*, that is, extension as a single, whole substance. Then there are tertiary substances which are individual bodies (what I have been calling “extended substances”). Sowaal provides textual evidence for her interpretation by noting that in some places, Descartes speaks of extended substance “taken in the general sense” while elsewhere he refers simply to “bodies” (AT VII, 14).

Of the three substances, the degree of reality is greatest for God and least for bodies. Because the degree of reality of bodies is so low, full Cartesian metaphysical rigor can be achieved only when considering primary and secondary substances. Tertiary substances are understood only as individuated by sensation, which is ultimately confused rather than clear and distinct (Sowaal 2005, 259).

We can regard tertiary substances as modes of the secondary substance *res extensa*. Thus, bodies can be understood in two ways: they “have an ontological status at both the secondary and tertiary levels—in addition to being [tertiary] substances, bodies are also [secondary] modes” (Sowaal 2004, 231).

There are attributes and modes associated with each of the three types of substances. Thus, it is appropriate to speak of primary, secondary, and tertiary attributes and secondary and tertiary modes (there are no primary modes because of God’s invariable nature). Sowaal argues that tertiary attributes mirror particular secondary attributes—the tertiary attribute is a delimitation of the secondary attribute. She elucidates the point:

For example, as *res extensa* has indefinite size as one of its secondary attributes, bodies have some finite size or other as one of their tertiary attributes; further, as *res extensa* has its quantity of motion as one of its secondary attributes, bodies have some local motion or other as one of their tertiary attributes (Sowaal

2005, 259).

Sowaal’s distinction between secondary and tertiary substances, attributes, and modes has a potential problem. If attributes are, by definition, unchanging, (see AT VIIIA, 26; Sowaal 2004, 228) then how can she argue that the local motion of a body (to use the example given above) is a tertiary attribute when local motion is variable (taking on different values at different times)? The resolution of this potential problem comes in a full understanding of attributes in Descartes’ ontology. Nolan’s theory of attributes sheds light on the subject.

Nolan interprets a crucial text as implying that an attribute has the same status as a mode of thought—that it is, literally, a “way” of thinking about something (AT IV, 348-349; Nolan 1997, 132). As such, things that are rationally distinct are identical external to the mind—in reality. He explains: “We generate a rational distinction in our thought by taking a substance which is singular, and not diverse in itself, and regarding it in diverse ways” (Nolan 1997, 136).

In light of this interpretation, a substance and the attributes associated with it are identical in reality even if they are conceived differently. Indeed, the difference between a substance’s attributes “does not arise in the substance itself but from our abstract ways of regarding it” (Nolan 1997, 136-7). So, returning to Sowaal’s seemingly problematic example, we may conceive a distinction between the bodies and the tertiary attributes of local motion and local rest but, in reality, either attribute is identical to the body in question and therefore unchanging in reality (so long as the body is unchanging).

Taken together, the interpretations of Sowaal and Nolan seem to constitute a coherent version of Cartesian ontology (one that is also consistent with Descartes’ text). The real justification for the this approach to the relevant metaphysics, however, comes when it is considered in relation to problematic topics (such as force).² As we will see in the next section, it seems to dissolve some very hard interpretive problems away.

3.2 Reinterpreting Force

When some body or another is discussed, Descartes explicitly speaks of the forces “of” that body (AT IXB, 88). This seems to imply that, whatever

²For an example of another problematic topic that this theory helps clarify see the discussion of the consistency of collision laws in Sowaal 2004, 239.

else is the case, forces should most definitely be tied back to extension. The question is how exactly this is to be accomplished.

I believe that in Descartes' physics, "force" is, properly speaking, both a secondary attribute of *res extensa* and tertiary attribute of particular bodies. In accordance with Sowaal's account, it is the (more "real") secondary attribute of force that is delimited by the (what others have called the "calculable") tertiary attribute of force of motion or of rest. Here, one may object. If attributes are the general (i.e. unchanging) aspects of a substance, how is it that force (something regarded by previous commentators as a variable aspect of bodies) can be an attribute? The answer lies in the theory of attributes as presented by Nolan. We may conceive a distinction between the tertiary attributes of force of motion or force of rest but, in reality, the two attributes are identical (not only to each other but also to the body itself) and therefore unchanging in reality.

One may ask what exactly the relationship is between the tertiary attributes of force of motion and local motion. Because they are both attributes, in reality, they are identical in any given body. But what is the distinction between them in our thought? I believe that the attribute of force of motion demonstrates the cause of motion in a body whereas the attribute of local motion demonstrates the motion itself. To see why this might be, recall that Gueroult held that forces "directly express the creative action or will of God (1980, 198) and that Hatfield felt force was grounded in God because it was God who is the "first or primary cause of motion" ([1979] 1998, 290).

Finally, because force is the attribute demonstrating the cause of motion (God) in bodies, one may ask what the relationship is between God and the attribute of force. In my interpretation, God creates and maintains *res extensa* (which is, strictly speaking, identical to force at the secondary level) such that it *appears* to us when we make sensory observations that bodies interact in a regular fashion, in accordance with law three. This view differs from the traditional interpretation that God "causes" the motion or rest (through forces) involved in impact collisions by directly varying the motions of bodies in a lawlike way (Sowaal 2004, 232-233). Notice, however, that this traditional view contradicts Descartes' position that "any variation of God is unintelligible" (AT VIII A, 26). If, as explained, we view God as creating and maintaining *res extensa* in an invariable way (the variable aspects of motions imparted from body to body through force being just appearances to us), this traditional problem dissolves.

3.3 Resolving Previous Difficulties

The interpretation presented in the last section seems to provide a coherent and consistent way of understanding Cartesian force but it still must be scrutinized to determine if this is really the case. My scrutiny will consist in considering to what extent the theory holds up against the (rather large) set of difficulties collected from each of the previous interpretations of force. I maintain that the force-as-extension interpretation resolves *all* of the difficulties in the set.

Naive Approach

The first of the problems encountered was that of the naive approach to ground force in extension. Recall that this came in two parts. On the one hand, all of physics must be understood in terms of extended substance and geometrically defined motion. On the other hand, it was unclear how the “imparting” of motion from one body to another in law three (through forces) was to be understood geometrically.

I believe that clarifying the relationship between God and force (as presented in the last section) eases this tension. God creates and maintains *res extensa* (strictly speaking, identical to force at the secondary level) such that it *appears* to us that bodies interact in a regular fashion, in accordance with law three. Motion and rest are distinguished only in thought and so the “imparting” of motion is only apparent. This interpretation is supported textually by a letter Descartes wrote to Henry More:

You observe correctly that a motion...cannot pass from one body to another. But that is not what I wrote [in the explanations of law three]...The force causing motion...is a mode in creature, but not in God; but because this was not easy for everyone to understand, I did not want to discuss it in my writings (AT V, 401-2).

Thus, it seems that because the imparting of motion through force is something that occurs entirely “in creature”, objectively speaking (“in God”) there is no such transfer of motion. Thus, our attempt to geometrically understand the imparting of motion through force is misguided. It is our confused, sensory thought (as opposed to distinct, purely intellectual thought) that provides the impulse to view force as anything but *res extensa* itself.

Hatfield

Hatfield argued that God was “responsible” for the force that governs the transfer of motion between bodies. This was well supported textually. From this position, however, he hastily argued his thesis that God *is* the force that governs the transfer of motion between bodies. This latter position was one that was not supported well with explicit text. In fact, quite to the contrary: textual evidence showing the forces “of” bodies proved to be his most serious problem. How can a force “of” a body be “in” God and not “in” the body?

The force-as-extension view I have adopted nicely provides an understanding of force which is (a) consistent with Hatfield’s well defended position that God is “responsible” for the forces that governs the interaction of bodies but which is also (b) such that force is not “in” God but “in” bodies. In our interpretation, God is “responsible” for the force that governs interactions between bodies because God is the creator and preserver of *res extensa* which is identical to secondary force. But of course, because force is also an attribute of the tertiary substance of bodies, it can be considered to be “in” bodies.

Gueroult and Gabbey

Recall that one position Gueroult held was that force was identical with the (invariable) attributes of existence and duration in bodies. This position proved problematic when the varying nature of calculable forces was considered. How exactly could an invariable attribute be regarded, in some way, as varying? Note first that, strictly speaking, Gueroult’s interpretation of force is fundamentally the same as the one we have presented. Because attributes are modes of thought, they are only rationally distinct. The tertiary attributes of existence and duration in a body are identical with that body and thus, identical with the tertiary attribute of force. The variation comes, as we have seen, from our experience of a rational distinction between the tertiary attributes of force of motion or force of rest.

Finally, consider the difficulty Gabbey encounters. He views force as both being grounded in God and also being in body as a mode. But Descartes is committed to the position that everything in body must be conceived as a mode of extended substance. How exactly is force a mode of extended substance? Gabbey does not say. In our theory, however, we *can* say exactly how it is possible for force to be in bodies and also be modes of extended substance. First consider that the tertiary attribute of force “in” a body is identical to that body. But we also know that bodies are modes of *res extensa*. So, the tertiary attribute of force is a secondary mode of

extended substance (*res extensa*).

Garber

Garber held that “force” is not an ontological reality but a “way of talking” about God’s creative and preserving activities. The difficulty was that the theory had no explicit textual support for this position. In fact, the text seems to strongly suggest the opposite. However, our proposed interpretation of force is such that it takes Descartes at his word in his various writings on force. The concept of force is not trivialized but taken seriously as having a real ontological status that fits consistently and rigorously within his larger system.

4 Conclusion

Clearly, the force-as-extension interpretation that I have proposed handles nicely the difficulties encountered by the previous commentators. The success at resolving these long-standing problems, I believe, justifies the theory in some sense. But, I want to highlight another positive aspect of our interpretation that has little to do with resolving difficulties. Instead, I propose that the theory provides proper perspective in that it shows *why* each of the previous commentators viewed force as they did and also just how close each of them came to the consistent theory they desired. In other words, I believe that my proposed interpretation of force does not show how everyone was “wrong” but how everyone was more or less “right” all along!

To see this, consider first the interpretation of Gueroult. His view under the new interpretation is exactly the same as the one I have proposed. Force for Gueroult are the attributes of duration and existence. But these attributes are, strictly speaking, the same as what I have been calling the “attribute” of force for all attributes are distinct only in thought. We also showed how the position of Gabbey was, under the new interpretation, the same as mine. Force can be thought of as a mode if it is a mode of the secondary substance *res extensa*. The new interpretation also shows why Hatfield grounded force in God: force is an unchanging attribute that demonstrates the cause of motion or rest (God). Finally, we can see why even the Garber interpretation was, in a sense, correct. For Descartes, we use the term “attribute” (of a substance) when we are “simply thinking in a more general way of what is in a substance” (AT VIII A, 26). So an attribute is a “way of thinking” or (when verbalized) a “way of talking” about a substance. So, under our interpretation, force can be considered a “way of

talking” about the objects of God’s creative and preserving activities—just as Garber claimed it was.

So we see that not only does viewing force as an secondary and tertiary attribute of *res extensa* and bodies resolve all the difficulties of previous interpretations, it does so in such a way as to support and justify those interpretations. That all the major theories converge to one single position gives strong evidence that the proposed view is a satisfactory alternative to understanding force in Cartesian physics.

References

- [1] Descartes, R. (1964-76). *Oeuvres de Descartes*. Adams, C. and P. Tannery (Eds.), (12 volumes), Paris: Vrin/CNRS.
- [2] Hatfield, G. (1998), “Force (God) in Descartes’ Physics,” *Descartes*, Cottingham, J. (ed.), 281-310. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [3] Gabbey, A. (1980), “Force and Inertia in the Seventeenth Century: Descartes and Newton,” *Descartes: Philosophy, Mathematics and Physics*. S. Gaukroger (Ed.), 230-320. Sussex: Harvester Press.
- [4] Garber, D. (1992), *Descartes’ Metaphysical Physics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [5] Gueroult, M. (1980), “The Metaphysics and Physics of Force in Descartes,” *Descartes: Philosophy, Mathematics and Physics*. S. Gaukroger (Ed.), 196-229. Sussex: Harvester Press.
- [6] Nelson, A. (1997), “Descartes’s Ontology of Thought,” *Topoi*. 16: 163-178.
- [7] Nolan, L. (1997), “Reductionism and Nominalism in Descartes’s Theory of Attributes,” *Topoi*. 16: 129-140.
- [8] Slowik, E. (2002), *Cartesian Spacetime*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [9] Sowaal, A. (2005), “Idealism and Cartesian Motion,” *A Companion to Rationalism*, A. Nelson (ed.), 250-261. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Company.
- [10] Sowaal, A. (2004), “Cartesian Bodies,” *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. 34: 217-240.

- [11] Westfall, R. (1971), *Force in Newton's Physics*. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company.