R. North Works Vol. XIX Natural Philosophy BL Add MS 32544<sup>1</sup>

UPDATED/REVIEWED April 2015

"& if this be not enough to say upon y<sup>e</sup> subject, I shall freely own that I cannot, & believe that few (if any) can to y<sup>e</sup> purpose say more. And that if I have not proved that every thing in these papers is true (excuse y<sup>e</sup> braggadochio) I shall most willingly go a great way to meet any one who shall prove any of them false"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Bound volume; external measurement, 200x220mm; made up of sheets 320x404, folded hoizontally to make pairs of folios 320x202, and folded vertically to produce eight sides or pages 160x202mm, then cut. All the sheets are of the same high quality paper, and each pair of sheets is [now] stitched. See also further comments on appearance and condition throughout the footnotes, below. The whole is written in Montague North's hand.

[colophon i]
(inner of board cover)
<in pencil:
m
388.a>

[colophon ii]
(binders' paper)
<stamped: ADD. MS. 32,544>

[colophon iii] (binder's paper) <page blank>

<unnumbered page>
<stamped: 32,544.>

<unnumbered blank page>

(1) 14

#### Discourses Introductory

1 Of percepti= on & union of y<sup>e</sup> mind & body<sup>3</sup>

In life ye first notion is of self existence, w<sup>ch</sup> (as I take it) Cartesius means by cogita= tion. But this seems not intuitive, as An= gells may be supposed to know themselves; but from an attachment to materiallity; whereof y<sup>e</sup> perpetual changes prove to be ye objects of our continuall percepti= on from  $y^e$  first to  $y^e$  last moment of life. If y<sup>e</sup> condition of y<sup>e</sup> materiall of our bodys continued always in  $y^{\rm e}$ same state, without change, It is hard to say that any perception cou'd be; And then  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  creature, if at all, must know it self by other means. as I hinted of angells. This perception by materiall changes Cartesius calls imagination; & so distinguisheth it from cogitation, but I must needs think they are one, & y<sup>e</sup> same; for if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  creature perceives at all, it is by means of imagination. But now considering these two,  $y^e$  Ani= mall & it's sShell<sup>5</sup> (y<sup>e</sup> Materiall part) joyned

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  The front page is darkened by exposure to dust, and has suffered some damage, and a degree of polish, by rubbing.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  The marginalia thoughout the *Physica* appear to have been added after the main body of the text, but usually in the same pen and ink that has been used for the main text.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Every page in the Physica has been numbered by MN, nearly all of them in the right order, and nearly all of them have the number written, as here, in brackets. The recto pages have been renumbered in pencil by the BM/BL curators. I use that numbering (e.g., fol. 45r, fol. 58v) as the reference numbering throughout.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Although the handwriting in the Physica is generally neat and well finished, MN frequently makes minor alterations as he goes - as here, changing a lower-case 's' for a large one by over-writing, or as in other cases changing a letter by the same means. Where I see this, I note it in this way.

(2)

/joyned together, one to observe, &  $y^{\rm e}$  other  $\$ (both being organized for y<sup>e</sup> purpose) to be observed, an united intelligent being Re= sults; w<sup>ch</sup> In y<sup>e</sup> course of life, having a be= ginning in utmost simplicity, paSseth thro' innumerable varietys of change, untill y<sup>e</sup> organization diSsolves, & then y<sup>e</sup> union ceaseth, & one part goeth into ye comm/o\n mixture of things, & y<sup>e</sup> other into a state solute from all materiallity, & (as wee Respecting our selves religiously believe) continues to exist in a different order or state of sensible living. That these two, y<sup>e</sup> mind & y<sup>e</sup> body are plainely di= verse one from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  other, however they come to be united in life may hereafter be demonstrated; but at present we are too early; I am sure it is Expedi= ent sooner or later to endeavour it, Considering ye turne it will take in ye overthrow of all Atheism, & Irreligi= on.7

Here finding our selves capable of obser= vation experiment & discourse, wee launch into speculations of y<sup>e</sup> whole state of humanity, & to that we con= fine our selves; And it concerns us not here to determine, whither Brutes have sense & Conclude, as we do, for wee

cannot

 $^{\rm 6}$  MN has begun writing the looped upright of the letter 'B' twice to the left of the eventual letter 'B'.

<red BM stamp>

2 Brutes<sup>6</sup> not spe= culative

<del>(3)</del> 2

cannot know them as (by means of speech) we know one another; It is enough for us to conclude of them as we wou'd of a silent man, that is from a paralell behaviour; It is hard to say what is  $y^{\rm e}$ difference between dumb animalls & speechleSs savages. But ye subject is become problematiq, & some prime phi= losophers take advantage to maintain either partie, as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Cartesians for instance argue that Brutes are meer automata, without sense or thinking, that their actions are but similitudinary, & pro= ceed Not of thought or Memory: And for reason Alledge that none can be made speak or answer questions. And I am satisfyed that untill Brutes do speak, this Captious opinion, as others of subjects altogether in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  dark, will not be formally Confuted. But in y<sup>e</sup> mean time, all indifferent Coniseu/rs\. as well as almost ye whole race of man= kind will attribute sensation, thought & memory to Brutes; however it appears in various

(4)

in various measures & distinctions; & that there is not such reason to allow them Science or abstract thinking; but sen= sation of things, & of  $y^e$  consequences of good or evil to themselves, & in  $y^e$ end certainly perish. But more of this elsewhere.

I shall here move all Inquiry Into ye secrets of this union of mind & body with y<sup>e</sup> miysterys of generation, Nutri= tion, <u>Instinct</u>, & diSsolution: & at present be satisfyed with having gained a hu= mane person, (by a common course of life & vegetation) arived to a degree of strength, & Capable by y<sup>e</sup> use of his facultys, to know as much of y<sup>e</sup> sensible world, as he happens to be concerned with;  $\underline{w^{ch}}$  faculties are (directly) sen= sation, & (Reflexly) Memory. From ythese he advanceth to opinion, & so to ex= periment, by w<sup>ch</sup> means only opinions are regulated according to truth. The sence that is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  knowledge of exterior beings, Cannot be had otherw/w\ise8 than by touch of

3 The man= ner of sen/ce\ & self re= flexion

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> It often happens that MN's pen *accidently* blots out a letter or part of a word as he writes, he corrects this accidental blotting by adding a correction, as transcribed here.

<del>(5)</del> 3

of (or from) them upon some parts of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ animall body or frame: by w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> parts affected are more or leSs disturbed, & that (disturbance) or differences (compa= ratively) ye united soul cannot but ob= serve: Then supposing an apathy of y<sup>e</sup> mind, or y<sup>e</sup> body wholly unaltered, yet when a restoration happens, there emer= geth a connexion & comparison of ye two states, that before, & that after  $y^{\rm e}$ [CieSsation?]<sup>9</sup> as if no time had intervened, for what is a series of time but a negation of all intermiSsion or termes that im= ply it; but to return to ye sensible state,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  may be adumbrated by a spider in his seat of observation upon his webb extended largely to all parts about a room; Nothing can touch ye finest thread of this texture in any part, but ye creature shall instantly perceive it, & prepare for action accordingly. So our bodies are as y<sup>e</sup> webb Continually Elastick, over w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> mind or soul [+-?]/pre\ sides. And as without some impreSsion derived

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Where I am not sure of my reading of a word I have used square brackets and a question mark [?] - thus you will find it where the text becomes illegible (to me). Rather than repeatedly insert '*sic*' I have also used [?] to indicate a form, or spelling, that puzzled me, even where I could read it, but thought it might have been a slip of MN's pen. I make as few comments of this kind as possible when I am confident that I have read the MS correctly, and where it seems clear that the reader can make (mine, or their own) sense of even a mis-written word.

### How sen= sation is distingui= shed

### Physica

(6)

derived from exterior action, y<sup>e</sup> Mind wou'd Gather or Know nothing of y<sup>e</sup> world abroad, & perhaps not of its own existence, so y<sup>e</sup> perpetuall agita/[c?]\tion of y<sup>e</sup>. contiguous matter variously imreSsing y<sup>e</sup> surfaces of y<sup>e</sup> body externally or internally y<sup>e</sup> mind is imbued with a continuall sence of it self, & that instills y<sup>e</sup> notion of life & time, y<sup>e</sup> during such ceSsation as above wou'd not be had.

Hence it is concluded, that all sensation is no other than materiall pulses upon y<sup>e</sup> (webb or) exterior surfaces or some internal receSses of our bodys. But such is y<sup>e</sup> diversity of [----?]/the\<sup>se</sup> pulses, & also of y<sup>e</sup> parts of our bodys impelled, that y<sup>e</sup> mind shall be affected with conti= nuall variety Corresponding those im= preSsions; And y<sup>e</sup> more violent pulses that fall with distinguishable inter= valls (whilst y<sup>e</sup> fainter are unreguar= ded) will be more eminently perceived, than y<sup>e</sup> leSs violent. And so when di= verse fall upon y<sup>e</sup> several members,

or parts

or parts of our bodys, distingu/isht\isht by experiment or use one from another: they tun into ClaSses in Infinitum. As what falls upon y<sup>e</sup> optick nerve, gives  $y^{\rm e}$  sensation called light & thereby vision, very different from what falls upon ye tympanum of ye Ear, Cal= led Hearing. In ye sensation of light there are numberleSs varietys, whereof y<sup>e</sup> chief are called colours, w<sup>ch</sup> are only pulses differently modifyed: And under hea= ring arrive  $y^{\rm e}$  variety of sounds,  $y^{\rm e}$  most egregious of w<sup>ch</sup> are called Harmony, & act by pulses in known proportion tho not sensibly distinct, & it's pitty those of light & colours are not (as of sounds) so clearly discovered. What is say'd of these two Energys extends ana= logically to all other branches of sen= sation, as tast, feeling &c. therefore it will be superfluous to instance in more. And of these in another place where it is purposed to discourse more /fully.{\_}\. Here

{\_}<sup>10</sup>

4r

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 10}$  See note on fol. 7v, below.

5.
Of Ideas,
attention
& Memory

### (8)(9)<sup>11</sup> Physica

Here is all that can concern us ab extra, 12 that is touch or motive im= pulse upon ye materiall of our bodys, And whoever will pretend other means of influencing our perception must be pleased to demonstrate  $y^e$  what &  $y^e$  how, or else meer nothing is held forth. And now it is to be inquired how  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  knowledge arrives, whereby we determine y<sup>e</sup> nature of those things w<sup>ch</sup> so affect us; & for this wee must inspect  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  inferiora, and there wee find first an image in  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  mind, or sence of a difference or change com= paratively w<sup>ch</sup> is called an <u>Idea</u>, pecu= liar to each varia/e\ty of touch, whither from  $y^e$  materiall, as hard, soft, moist, dry &c. or from  $y^{\rm e}$  different parts of ye body as ye Eye, Ear, Arm, Legg &c. And next, that these Ideas do not vanish upon ceasing of y<sup>e</sup> influence whereby ye parts, as springs, Resulting take again y<sup>e</sup> former positure, but as Lead or wax Retain ye impreSsion, till by many following attaques the

impreSsion

W<sup>13</sup>

 $^{11}$  MN has written '(8)', which he has blotted when correcting to '9', and then (it would seem, later) he has written '(9)' next to it. This is page 8, but the numbering from here on proceeds as if this were page 9.

<sup>12</sup> i.e., 'from outside'.

 $^{13}$  At the foot of the page, in the middle, the letter 'w' has been written so close to the bottom edge that the previous page has been marked with ink. The following two pages were simultaneously marked with the top of the letter.

### Physica (10) 5

impreSsion is gradually defaced, & often worn quite out; as y<sup>e</sup> presiding mind (by like means [  $\ldots \ldots \ldots ?$  ]whereby it was  $^{14}$  at first affected) knows things by their differen= ces; So also it hath an affection from y<sup>e</sup> differences of these remaining impreS= sions, w<sup>ch</sup> faculty we call memory: By means whereof Ideas of things past & present are compared: And by a won= derfull power  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  mind paSseth arbitrarily to & from among these impreSsions, & dwells or departs according to contingent Fan= cy or determination. The continuance of of this agency upon certein subjects, is called attention, And that is ever at work but in sleep, w<sup>ch</sup> is little else but a surren= der of all power of attention for a time, & then y<sup>e</sup> mind (Dreaming) roves about its Magazition of impreSsions, without stopp or order of time, till y<sup>e</sup> attention (by waking) Resumes  $y^{\rm e}$  reines, & then  $y^{\rm e}$ mind proceeds orderly again, as  $y^{\rm e}~{\rm will}/{\rm ll^{15}}$ or such

 $<sup>^{14}</sup>$  'whereby it was' is written over some washed out text (outline text, as here, is used throughout to represent washed out text).

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 15}$  Rather than being blotted, the two 'l's appear to have washed out or brushed away by accident, MN has re-written them.

### Physica

(11)

or such Incidents as then happen to Incline it, Invites; This is a copious subject, & admi/tts\ a world of reflexon, but is only touch'd upon here, to shew ho[-?]w thinking is de= rived upon materiall influences ab Extra.

But however those influences fall, ye Ideas in y<sup>e</sup> mind occasioned by them, are found only there,  $\ensuremath{\&}$  not in anything that gives  $y^{\text{e}}$  occasion, all  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is but touch, & nothing else; As when when  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm Ideas}\ {\rm are}\ {\rm of}$ colour, sound or (to instance in y<sup>e</sup> most observable) of pleasure or pain,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  are extant only in  $y^{\rm e}$  imagination, & of such none subsist in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  object; Who ever thought that ye Idea of pain subsis= ted in y<sup>e</sup> sword that made y<sup>e</sup> wound? or that Harmony was to be found a= mong y<sup>e</sup> fiddle-strings, tho' y<sup>e</sup> Idea of it is excited or occasioned by them, & that only by means of pulsation in ordinate, (but indistinguishable) times? Therefore

6 Ideas of sence in y<sup>e</sup> mind only & not in y<sup>e</sup> exte= rior cause Physica (<del>12</del>) 6

Therefore it is Concluded that all  $y^e$ ideas of sence are Interior arising & Resident in  $y^e$  mind only, & not in any object or matter without us. And whoever doth not take & digest this Notion clearly, can never think Phi= losophically, or overtake any natu= rall truths of Externall things, Res alias agat.<sup>16</sup>

From hence it appears how y<sup>e</sup> common method of knowledge is eCorrupted, & with what difficulty (if at all) mens minds may be set right. For among y<sup>e</sup> community, who is there that as soon as they know what is y<sup>e</sup> Cause of any Idea, do not translate that very Idea from their minds to y<sup>e</sup> thing that cau= seth it?- As when they see y<sup>e</sup> colour blew, or yellow, w<sup>ch</sup> proceeds from a certain confusion or Mixture of (indistinguishable) touches, they instant/ly\ - say

7 Whence errors of Judgment, & Preju= dice

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> i.e., 'let him do something else'.

### (13) Physica.

say that colour is in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\boldsymbol{e}}$  object, or comes from it. So of heat, that it is in  $y^e$ fire, & Cold in  $y^{\rm e}$  ayre, all  $w^{\rm ch}$  Ideas are but modes of sensation, Et prae= terea nihil.  $^{\rm 17}\ {\rm How}$  therefore should truth ever be known, So as for us to be able to judge of what is with= out us? at present wee are got no further than opinion, w<sup>ch</sup> is acciden= tall, & for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  most part false. And when such devious opinions prove hard to be corrected,  $\underline{\text{they are called}}$ prejudices, w<sup>ch</sup> are  $/y^{e}$  main obstacles ag:<sup>st</sup> all right understanding. And  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  worst is men commonly add obstinacy & paSsi= on to Prejudice. A new born child admires  $y^{\rm e}$  light, & judgeth it to be in ye candle just as it is in its Idea, So as men grow up, they continue  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ same way of erroneous thinking, & strive against all conviction.

But

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> i.e., 'and otherwise nothing'.

7r

8 Knowledge not by meer sence but by expe= riment Physica (14) 7

But notwithstanding all this, wee have no other means of knowing truly any thing but sensation. And  $\frac{th}{th}$  know= ledge is brought about, not directly, or by pure perception, but by ex= periment; w<sup>ch</sup> is made by applicati= on of sence in divers manners (or rather divers sences) to one & ye same Object, & that will best be explained by some ordinary practises. As if a guilt Ball is presented, that affords  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same Idea as gold it self, but being handled is found to be wood; & if it proves still heavy, a rasure upon y<sup>e</sup> superfices, discovers it to be lead, &  $y^{\rm e}$ covering only gold. A child in a coach thinks  $y^{\text{e}}$  trees move,  $y^{\text{e}}$  Idea being  $y^{\text{e}}$ same as if they did so; But a fore= knowledge of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  condition of trees, Convinces an adult person, that it is only  $y^{\rm e}$  parallactick change of  $y^{\rm e}$ 

position

{\_}

#### (15) Physica

Position  $w^{\rm ch}$  makes them seem to move, Distances of things are not determi= ned by view, for a Landscape is to sence (like a picture) a meer flatt, but ye experience of magnitudes & [vi= sive?] distinctions by various. distances makes y<sup>e</sup> discovery{, }& even y<sup>e</sup> picture seem hollow. All w<sup>ch</sup> knowledge, where= of infinite Instances may be given, is obtained not by direct sence, but by accumulation of experiments,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  in such extent is called common experience. And this grows up in men chiefly out of ye ordinary transactions of life; Whereby they gain  $y^e$  proofs of most objects that commonly occurr, & with w<sup>ch</sup> they have frequent concern. And y<sup>e</sup> collection of these truths may be called also commion sense; but when things are not obviously experimentable, & Impart nothing

Materiall

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Across the page opening 7v-8r there appear to be six horizontal dashes marked in a very softleaded pencil - one in each of the four margins, and one in the middle of each block of text, apparently suggesting a correction to be made. Such marks recurr throughout this volume. I indicate them here and elsewhere in the margins by {\_} or (where it is a word or comment) {word}. Sometimes, in the text, there is a dart suggesting the insertion of a word{/insert\}, sometimes a word is crossed-out { erossed out}, in each case I have indicated the 'correction' by the same curly brackets and underlining. On a few occasions in the Physica the marks are vertical lines, which I have indicated by  $\{\bot\}$ . Sometimes there is *only* a pencil mark in the text (also indicated by curly brackets and underlining). MN's own underlinings in ink are indicated by underlined text without any brackets. The marks are editorial which, if not immediately apparent, becomes clear later in the MS where specific underlinings of words and phrases, and marginal comments or clarifications of badly written words appear, usually in alignement with pencilled dashes like these (see, for example, page opening f. 75v-f. 76r). The BM curators have used pencil throughout to change the page/folio number on each recto as has shown on each page from the beginning, but the 'editorial' marks we are here discussing are in a much softer graphite. They are most likely by RN himself (see other clues concerning dating, for example that offered by the reference to the 'theory of Sounds' on fol. 191v, below). The marks and writing is very shaky indicating an elderly hand. There appear to be six marks on this page opening but in fact the marks on one side are the result of the transfer of this very soft graphite from the one to the other (this happens throughout the volume). So, across this opening, the outer mark on f. 7v is 'reflected' on f. 8r, and the inner margin mark on f. 8r is 'reflected' on f. 7v. Here and elsewhere I have only indicated the 'positive' marks.

Materiall to life, as whither colour or sound exist within or without us, wee are not Concerned to apply either thoughts or experiments abo/u\ut them; but in opinion such ordinary Ideas paSs for y<sup>e</sup> very truth of those matters; And here lyes  $y^e$  case of philosophicall speculations,  $w^{ch}$  also lean{\_}upon expe= riences; Some in y<sup>e</sup> way of vulgar practise, others of deeper research, by w<sup>ch</sup> after due reflection it is dis= covered, that Ideas of sence are not in y<sup>e</sup> object; And that y<sup>e</sup> mag= nitude, distances, & motions of  $y^{\rm e}$  ce= lestiall luminarys are not as they seem. And that  $y^{\rm e}$  matter of  $y^{\rm e}$  world hath no property inherent, but on= ly filling place & impenetrability; And that all other phaenomena are but sensitive Ideas; with many other like topicks of naturall science. Wee

are not

{\_}}

(17) Physica

are not to let it paSs that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  meer sence of matters obvious & common= ly experimented will instruct any use= full practices, for Ideots & brutes have all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\boldsymbol{e}}$  same sensations. But it is an application of thought & memory working comparatively, that raiseth veritable notions, & of these even  $y^{\rm e}$ vulgar, as well as phylosophicall per= sons have the/e\ir share, according to their several engagements; And a common mechanick shall interpret a diversifyed view of numerous ob= jects,{\_}as philosopher, tho there is no truth in  $y^{\rm e}$  Ideas of magnitude, Co= lour or proportion yet it is acquired (as all knowledge Results) from ex= perience; And Indeed supposing a due application of thought upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  most ordinary occurrents observable in ye course of human practises, there will

be little

{\_}

### Physica (18) 9

be <u>little need of exotick experiments</u>, for those others will serve  $y^e$  turn, & Cartesius himself used mostly  $y^e$  like.

### Of Natural Principle

The tendency of these discourses is (if it may be) to adjust ye notion of what things are really existent in y<sup>e</sup> universe, abstracting all sense, & as if all sensitive beings were annihilated, & what are non existent but in our sense only. As yet wee are advanced no further than y<sup>e</sup> discovery of one on= ly genus or principle, upon  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  in  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  science of naturall things we can surely rely. And that is matter extended, mensurable & im= penetrable, Influencing by meer touch. And whatever notions can be showed neceSsarily Resulting from what we know of such mat= ter, & its apparent modes, may be set down for truths inviolable, & that such solutions of naturall phaenomena, as are founded, or derived thereupon, & None else may be re= lyed on: And diverse have for that end used this

Body the only Prin= ciple to be Relyed on False Hy=
potheses E=
picurean
Aristote=
{\_}lian, Car=
tesian, New
tonian; &
Chymicall

## Physica.

(19)

This Hypothesis, w<sup>ch</sup> is called y<sup>e</sup> Corpuscular, but few or rather none with that justice, & Retention as ought to be; that is to carry it on so far as a just reasoning will warrant, & no further; & as for y<sup>e</sup> rest to sit down contented w<sup>ch</sup> is better than to spoil all with doubtfull gueSsing & there|upon pesi/osi\ tively to affirm non Entitys; for in naturall philosophy Nothing should be affirmed pre= cisely w<sup>ch</sup> in thing or manner any one can with reasoning or countenance deny. So here Prest securely upon this one Principle, un= derstood by y<sup>e</sup> word, body or matter; whether wee shall find, or rather have occasion for more y<sup>e</sup> sequell will discover.

The most celebrated naturalists in  $y^e$  seve= rall ages of literature, Instead of things, have taken  $y^e$  phaenomena of them for principles; or { $\frac{1}{2}$ }ather, joined  $y^e$  one with  $y^e$  other & accordingly framed their Hypotheses, & a= dorned them with such suppositious Ener= gys as they judged woud be most easily admitted. First  $y^e$  Atomists ledd by Demo= critus who sent his insecables<sup>20</sup> to stray, & take

 $<sup>^{19}</sup>$  Ther are a number of large splashes of spilt ink on this page opening which have not been pressed onto each other.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Democritus called the building blocks of matter 'insecables' (i.e. 'indivisibles').

{\_}}

Physica.

(<del>20</del>) 10

{<u>th</u>}eir chance by gravitating in vacuo in= finito, & this seeming not clutter enough, Epicurus sent in a party that shoud move croSs y<sup>e</sup> stream of y<sup>e</sup> others obliquely, that/at/ chance might have means to operate. This being but shew'd is Eo Nomine<sup>21</sup> Con= futed, for what is it else but a preca= rious Imagination? Aristotle bid defy= ance to these & all other ye Physici in generall, &. set up a science of meer words, by w<sup>ch</sup> he cou'd dispute or resolve any thing, whereas  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  others (faculties failing) were at a stand; Hence Matter, Form, Privation Qualities & substantiall forms &c. & his physis or nature like a Deity presiding over all. That  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is most wonderfull is that this pretended philosophy shou'd ride admirall in all y<sup>e</sup> schools of lear= ning for many hundred years, till Bacon, Ramus, GaSsendus, &c Insulted ye frothy Co= loSsus; & at length  $y^{\rm e}$  Cartesians overthrew it, Never to rise again. And that (Cartesian) sect however coming neerest truth in general/libus\,  $^{\rm 22}$ [libus]yet

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> i.e., 'under that name', i.r., 'explicitly'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> i.e., 'generalities', 'in general'.

(21)

yet in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  formed Hypothesis have aSsumed for principles certain stated formes & fi= gures, as well as motions of imperceptible matter, w<sup>ch</sup> are so open to a prompt denyall as makes all y<sup>e</sup> usefull inventions of Des= Cartes of leSs authority.  $^{\rm 23}$  And  $y^{\rm e}$  underminers that come after, take advantage thereby (Most Candidly) to deride ye greatest, & (for it's time) most succeSsfull work{ }that hath been known. These latter beyond all that have gone before are authors of suppo= sitious principles, as (to instance in some) Universall vacuity, & Coattraction of body, Materia rara & densa,24 Centripetal, Centri= fugall, & Inertiall powers, of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  more else= where. Nothing leSs than indubitable ex= periment will sustain universall prin= ciples. I must not omitt y<sup>e</sup> vain hypo= thesis of ye Chymists, who claim Salt, Sul= phur, & Mercury for principles of all things, Each of w<sup>ch</sup> needs an Analysis, as much as any other Compounds, & more especiall ye Salino-nerio-nitro Sulphu= reo particles of  $M^{\rm r}$  Mayo  $w^{\rm ch}$  in phi= losophy

{\_}}

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> RN laments here, as elsewhere in the MSS, that Descartes expressed his ideas and circulated them when they were not yet fully worked out, and therefore not quite correctly expressed. Descartes urgency to publish (much of which was not to a public, but by means of private letters to friends – letters which were then published after his death) meant that Descartes' insights and understandings were sometimes betrayed by his informality and expression – one example of this, for RN, was the notion of 'conatus', a concept inherently 'aristotelian', implying as it does a 'quality', which was nevertheless used by Descartes to describe the capacity for movement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> i.e., 'matter rare and dense'.

### Physica (<del>22</del>) 11

## losophy are Ignota per [mueto?] Ignotiora.<sup>25</sup>

Now to clear ye way for what is to come aft= ter, wee must prepare our selves to aS= sume [.....?]  $y^e$  one universall & indubitable principle, profered before & instead of depriving its simplicity & incumbring it with propertys or quallitys beyond its reall ESsence, wee must depose all power of prejudice & Imagination, & lay aside all ye Ideas of sensation, & speculatively lean only upon  $y^{\rm e}$  notion of ESence im= penetrable that is Body,  $y^e$  has no de= pendence on our thinking, & is understood or known by no means /but\  $\Theta =$  contact. But here wee meet an objection,  $w^{ch}$  is that we take no notice of ye intrinsick nature of body, w<sup>ch</sup> many say m<del>ust</del>ay have effects Consistent with impenetrability, & extend certain powers without or beyond ye sur= faces; And so occasion in us a sence of di= vers variations of things without impeach/ing\ their form & substances; And it is accounted an Insuperable charge upon  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  philosophers to Resolve

11r

11
Nothing
depends
on or flows
from y<sup>e</sup>
intrin=
sick na=
ture of
body.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> i.e.'the unknown by the unknown'; I have not been able to identify or trace this specific version of what is a widely-used latin tag. The general reference is to John Mayow (1640-79), chemist, experimenter and associate of Robert Boyle. He was actually much better than MN/RN allows here, anticipating the discovery of oxygen in his studies of respiration and combustion. The text referred to here seems to be Mayow's *Tractatus quinque medico-physici, quorum primus agit de sal-nitro et spiritu nitro- aereo ...*, Oxford, 1674.

### Physica.

(23)

to resolve  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  intrinsick nature of body, & ye Chymists labour hard for propertys, ESsential besides pure extension; to this it may be answered first, that if  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm cor}{=}$ puscular hypothesis will not solve all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  phaenomena of nature, yet it will go far enough, to shew there is no evi= dence of any thing intrinsick, to aSsist y<sup>e</sup> exterior effects; But if there be such influences they must be Corporeall or not; If not, they cou'd not affect body; And if flowing from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  superficies, they are but effluvia,  $w^{\mathrm{ch}}$  are admitted to part from solids, as odors, or  $y^{\rm e}$  like; If from within, being body (as it must be to act upon body) how shoud they penetrate forth? As for unintelligible powers & quallities; Let those take them that love  ${\tt them}/{\tt such}\$  misterys, therefore we lay all that Commentitious fancy of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  intrinsick nature of body aside, & adhere to  $y^e$  sin= gle & incomplex notion of impenetrabil= lity, & (of body) Ne plus Ultra.<sup>26</sup>

Every thing that is known to exist, must be perceived

12 The seve= rall modes 12r

of body under=

stood

Physica

# be perceive

be perceived under certein modes or cir= cumstances,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  modes may change infinite= ly, & y<sup>e</sup> thing in it self be in no sort al= tered. And body is never so much as thought of without regard to certein of its modes. First as to separation, where= by it appears distinct from all others; 2. as to magnitude w<sup>ch</sup> is comparison, & is styled great or little accordingly. 3. as to figure  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is  $y^{\text{e}}$  position of  $y^{\text{e}}$  parts res= pecting each other. 4. distance, or space interposing between one body & another 5. Aspects, as  $y^{\rm e}$  parts may be obverted or averted to or from any other. These modes & all distances Continuing in  $y^{\rm e}$ same state are called Rest. 6. Those dis= tances or aspects changing is called mo= tion. And both fall under y<sup>e</sup> same con sideration, that is distance Respecting ye Totum, & aspects Respecting y<sup>e</sup> parts. All these modes are referred to extension or Measure of space, & Nothing else, &  $y^{\rm e}$  body intrinsically

### Physica

(25)

intrinsically is not in any respect afec= ted thereby, but Remaines y<sup>e</sup> same in all respects, however y<sup>e</sup> modes that are found only in y<sup>e</sup> exteriora, alter or vary y<sup>e</sup> mea= sures in which they consist. Therefore of these modes None require further Con= sideration here except y<sup>e</sup> two last, that is change of distance & aspects, or conti= nuance of y<sup>e</sup> same, w<sup>ch</sup> under y<sup>e</sup> charac= ters of motion & rest have occasioned much puzling among y<sup>e</sup> philosophers; how y<sup>e</sup> Same existed, or were to be defined; Scarce agreeing in any thing. Therefore I shall take up y<sup>e</sup> matter, as fitt to be handled with clearneSs & distinction.

### Of motion what & how.

It will be neceSsary here to discourse of bodys in a method of singleneSs, & to sus= pend all regard to y<sup>e</sup> fullneSs & frequen= cy of things in y<sup>e</sup> world; & (complying with y<sup>e</sup> fancy of many) seem as if y<sup>e</sup> trans= actions were in a perfect vacuity, Re= serving our application to reallitys in pleno

Motion derived from col= lision of body else Nothing

 ${\tt Pleno}^{27}$  till wee come to proper places for it, And first as to ye common distances of things, [....?]Suppose (for instance) 2 bodys A & B in vacuo, y<sup>e</sup> intervening space be= longs to neither but indifferently to both, for if it be imputed to A as distant from B I return  $y^e$  same from B to A & if  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  distance happens to change, it is equally in both and Not in either, for ye summ is only that ye distance becomes leSs, or more; And y<sup>e</sup> same is inferred u= pon change of Aspects, w<sup>ch</sup> quoad<sup>28</sup> y<sup>e</sup> bo= dys under our regard is nothing at all. But this will neceSsarily require us to shew y<sup>e</sup> Consequences of distances chan= ging. What was ye occasion of any change of distance at first is not at present materiall. But will appear to have no influence on our Theory  $w^{\rm ch}$  will hold y<sup>e</sup> same in all states whatever, all antecedents being in this regard

meer

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> 'In pleno', literally 'in the fullness' (as he states it earlier in the same sentence), this is what is later discussed as the 'corpuscular theory' (*see* fol. 134v, below). The plenum or corpuscular theory proposes that the universe is made up not of a vacuum in which objects move according the attractive force of gravity, but that it is rather filled with an infinitely fine 'aether' within which the stars and their planets are suspended, and by which they are moved around in vortices. This is the principle assumption of MN/RN's cosmography.

27

meer nullitys. Therefore we must con= esider, that when distances continue chan= ging as between A & B they will either come to touch, or not; If ye latter ye bo= dys are unconcerned, for so nothing hap= pens to Induce any other alteration than hath been described, that is distance. But is y<sup>e</sup> bodys touch, then there is cause of further & other alteration, for Impenetrability most irresistiably inhibits that course  $\frac{1}{100}$  to continue, & Induceth a neceSsity for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  bodys to separate. And this fatall inconsistency is alike in both bodys but& not found in one only. So that if  $y^{\text{e}}$  Contact inclines B to separate  $\text{fr}\bar{\text{o}}$ A,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same inclines A to separate from B. Therefore  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  consequence must be that y<sup>e</sup> two bodys from a course of acceSsion must face into a course of separation, & that separation cannot be charged upon one or other, but both are participant as well of y<sup>e</sup> effect as they

(<del>28</del>) 14

they are of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  cause (a truth ever to be remembred).So that it will be a rule universall, that all bodys  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  advan= cong come to a contact will separate in one &  $y^{\rm e}$  same moment, but for what reason it falls out, that we ascribe more or leSs of y<sup>e</sup> cause, & of y<sup>e</sup> effect, & in certain proportions one way or other shall [-?]be CConsidered afterwards. I have often taken offence at a pre= judice w<sup>ch</sup> hath poSsest most of our phi= losophers; w<sup>ch</sup> is that motion [....?](I must be= gin to use the language) is somewhat reall, subsisting in body, distinct from  $y^{\rm e}$  Adamantine nature of it; & that upon Contacts w<sup>ch</sup> are called impulses, it paSseth from one to another, as if what was not transferred was left be= hind. Cartesius himself who was a great reformer in these matters yet was not free from this prejudice, but made mo= tion a sort of principle; And hence come

14 Motion no reall ESsence but a mode of bodys con sidered to= gether 15 Velocity. & compa= rison of Spaces

### Physica

29

come y<sup>e</sup> ordinary termes of paSsing, im= parting & communicating of motion from one body to another. And so a sort of seemingneSs creates in people notions of somewhat reall, very vain & wide from truth, y<sup>e</sup> fallacy of w<sup>ch</sup> upon a fair attention to things existent or not must appear. Therefore I shall proceed to consider some of y<sup>e</sup> varietys of modes attendant upon this action of bodys Res= pecting one another, w<sup>ch</sup> by degrees may elucidate y<sup>e</sup> subject entirely.

And first in y<sup>e</sup> Idea of Velocity; And that ariseth from comparison of ex= tension or spaces. For when y<sup>e</sup> distan= ces of two bodys from a third are y<sup>e</sup> same, & in approach y<sup>e</sup> one arrives at contact before y<sup>e</sup> other is arrived neerer than at half y<sup>e</sup> distance, y<sup>e</sup> velocity of y<sup>e</sup> former is accounted double of y<sup>e</sup> lat= ter; & so in all proportions, w<sup>ch</sup> are found Exactly in y<sup>e</sup> measures of y<sup>e</sup> spaces com/pared\ And

## Physica <del>30</del> 15

seeing that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  direct effects of all im= pulses, appear in y<sup>e</sup> succeeding velo= citys one way or other. And that wherever measure is found in causes,  $y^{\text{e}}$  like will fall out in  $y^{\text{e}}$  effects. (A common Axiom) In this case of a duple proportion, whatever y<sup>e</sup> celerity of y<sup>e</sup> separation would have been upon an impulse with a single velocity, shall upon an impulse with double, be also dupled. And hence comes one charac= ter of force,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  celerity of  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  ac= ceSs & separation (ceteris paribus),  $^{\rm 29}$  & so it is ascribed to velocity in /ye\ general, as when we say by swiftneSs force is encreast.

Another mode to be considered in mo= tive cases, w<sup>ch</sup> will have considerable consequences, is y<sup>e</sup> direction or deter mination of y<sup>e</sup> acceSs or separation; For that is always reall & not dependa/nt\ on any relation, It is not y<sup>e</sup> same

thing

16 Determi= nation of motion Reall

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> i.e., 'all other things being equal'.

31

thing, when  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  direction is to  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  north or East but  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  one from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  other is distinguished, as diverse spaces are; what these conse= quences may be in many respects, shall be reserved to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  place of mechanicall powers; but at present for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sake of clearneSs I shall suppose y<sup>e</sup> acceSs, & sepa= tion upon every impulse to be upon ye same line: And then I am bold to affirm, that whither  $y^e$  quantities of  $y^{\text{e}}$  bodys are equall or unequall  $w^{\text{ch}}$ (quantities are  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  other ingredient or character of force,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Resilition shall be with a velocity equall to that of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ acceSs, as if it were but a continua= tion of it, one case only excepted,  $w^{\rm ch}$ is when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  direction of both bodys after  $y^{\rm e}$  collision, shall fall out to be pointed towards  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same quarter, for then  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  greater body will always follow  $y^e$  leSser, &  $y^e$  velocity of  $y^e$  se= paration must diminish as y<sup>e</sup> quan= tity exceeds. These are but Hints in or/der  $\$ to a

<red BM stamp>

to a Resolution of Mechanicall pow= ers under w<sup>ch</sup> topick these points must be resumed, & better explained, & at pre= sent this physicall account may suf fice.

But I must take a step further, in order to explain y<sup>e</sup> subject of motion, & to diSsolve  $y^{\text{e}}$  prejudices, & false GloSses that have been put upon it. Therefore set= ting aside what follows consequentially upon contact, (Referred to  $y^{\rm e}$  Mecha= nicks) I do insist that all  $y^{\rm e}$  varietys  $w^{\rm ch}$ are commonly observed, & predicated of motion, & are understood by  $y^{\rm e}$  com= mon expreSsions of Moving, Resting, fast, slow, or y<sup>e</sup> like characters, are meerly relative (Except position as I shall shew) & have no existence in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  nature of things. And (among  $y^{\rm e}$  infinity of bo= dys, may be arbitrarily presumed, where= by Every motive alteration, May be one or other kind of motion. Nay in so

many

14. Motion consists wholly in relation. (33)

### Physica

many respects, as there are various relations made, & at  $y^{\rm e}$  same time (perhaps) be no motion at all but (as may be repu= ted) Meer rest. This supplants  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  question whither  $y^{\rm e}$  earth of heavens move,  $w^{\rm ch}$  some say is not demonstrable, for it is but al= ledging that it is all one, or y<sup>t</sup> neither moves, & it is not motion (a word misused) but change of position & aspects, w<sup>ch</sup> is equally applicable to both,  $y^e$  occasion of  $y^e$  mis= take is a mentall Supposition of some original cause applyed,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is not extant nor any thing to ye purpose. But now for clearing of these paradoxes, wee must consider, that in all judgement of motion, we appeal to something  $w^{ch}$ is supposed stationary or at Rest, & by y<sup>e</sup> scituation of that y<sup>e</sup> motion is judged. But if that Critical object in truth (or Relatively) does not rest, )but is carryed one way or other, y<sup>e</sup> Judgment is false, & perhaps that that was presumed to

rest,

# Physica (<del>3</del>4) 17

rest (collated with other things) was  $y^e$  true movent. There are so many instances of this deception & so obvious that it is fastidious to shew them; but this science is so important as to  $y^e$  knowledge of truths concerning our own & other bodys in motion collated, that I shall further explain  $y^e$  Nature of these relations.

Motive relations are made either to sin= gle objects, or to compounds, or systems of bodys; when singles we commonly plant our selves in y<sup>e</sup> place of rest, to arbitrate y<sup>e</sup> movements of every thing else; & accordingly some paSs here & some there; And such as hold y<sup>e</sup> same position respecting us, we say are at perfect rest. But if we call in another relation, as from y<sup>e</sup> terrene to y<sup>e</sup> celestial objects, Neither our own or any other bodys are at rest, but move in different manners from what was presumed. A shipp ag:<sup>st</sup>

a current

18. How such relations are judged

### Physica

(35)

a current shall Rusle as sailing hard, & so it doth, Referred to ye water, but touch  $y^{\rm e}$  ground, &  $y^{\rm e}$  Relation to that shews it does not move at all. So Re= ferences may be to  $\mathbb{y}^{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{systems}$  of bodys as to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts of a shipp. If a man walks from stem to stern as fast as y<sup>e</sup> shipp sails, Respecting ye mast & Rigging he moves fast, but Respecting ye Soyle he stands still, & if lying at anchor he walks as fast as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  diurnall motion (is easterly) westward,  $y^{\rm e}$  sun seems to stand still, but [yeet?] respecting ye annuall course,  $y^{\text{e}}$  ship & all that is in it partake of that unleSs a current carryed  $y^{\rm e}$  ship East= wards as fast, &  $\underline{y}^{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{then}~y^{\mathrm{e}}$  annuall course is at  $\underline{y}^{e}\text{rest},$  & (as ordinarily)  $y^{e}$  diurnall takes place. If ye Astronomers had not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  systeme of fixt starrs to referr all their planetary courses too; their art wou'd be at a loSs, how to account for any
## Physica (<del>36</del>) 18

any of them. So if you please to respect ye moon, Jupiter with his Satellits or any other Systeme of bodys in  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  whole uni= verse, y<sup>e</sup> Aspects & distances changing give a character of motion or rest to be, or not to be; & in infinite ways, at ye same time (as was observed) as well concurrent, contrarient, & (seeming) incon= sistent. Hence  $\underline{y}^{e}we$  derive  $y^{e}$  stations & Re= trogradations of y<sup>e</sup> planets. And I chal= lenge all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  virtuosi to shew me any thing subsisting in body's understood to move or rest, More than an exterior Relation by distances or aspects Reci= procally changing or continuing  $y^e$  same, according as References are made.

All this is designed in opposition to a new-fangled ditinction lately introdu= ced of motus verus & Relativus, first by Borellus<sup>31</sup> & then inforced by S<sup>r</sup> I. Newton. They

19. Against y<sup>e</sup> distinction of Motus verus & re= lativus<sup>30</sup>

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 30}$  i.e., 'true' (that is, absolute) and 'relative' motion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Giovanni Alfonso Borelli (1608-79), an Italian natural philosopher who experimented in and published on a wide range of topics from physiology to astronomy.

Physica

37

They cou'd not all motion of relation, because ye case is so manifestly obser= vable. But then to alledge a motus verus als[ $\Theta$ ]/o\ subsisting, in nation so dif= ferent as something is from nothing with= out shewing what it is, wherein exis= ting, or how to be known, is a procee= ding in philosophy so legislative, & ar= bitrary as useth not to be yielded to. Borellus makes a motion under-deck in a ship to be Relative viz: to y<sup>e</sup> ribbs and beams of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  veSsell, but above-board it is motus verus. Who sees not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  variety of this distinction? for without & with= in all relations are  $y^{\rm e}$  same as, if  $y^{\rm e}$ ship was transparent, wou'd be mani= fest. Principles of nature, as Motus Verus (if any such there be) Cannot be dis= tinguisht upon; as to say that motus is sometimes a principle; & sometimes not a principle Physica <del>38</del>19

principle, but so like it as one can scarce be known from  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  other. Or as if  $\boldsymbol{I}$ shoud say that that there is corpus ve= rum & corpus relativum,<sup>32</sup> it wou'd soun'd odly. And so will  $y^{\rm e}$  making any distinction upon a reall existence, w<sup>ch</sup> must be simply as it is, or nothing. Therefore I conclude all motion to be alike, as that w<sup>ch</sup> shews it plainly in being meer relation & nothing else. And I must observe that however we take relations obviously, & without much reflexion, yet in truth there is no body or System of bodys in  $y^{\rm e}$ whole universe, w<sup>ch</sup> being (arbitrarily) supposed stationary, but may be made a standard for  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  designation of any movement whatever; So that in this Respect, all  $y^{\text{e}}$  beings in  $y^{\text{e}}$  universe are Correlative, & so long as one thing may be said

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 32}$  i.e, 'true' body and 'relative' body.

(39)

### Physica

be said to move; Nothing in nature can be said to be at rest, & in a just estima= tion there is no such thing as Rest in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world, & if there were any, it woud be an existence as reall  $\pm as$  motion is pretended to be. How many vain puzle= ments about motion doth this specu= lation diSsolve? as of y<sup>e</sup> old Astronomers about one motion contrary to another; of Cartesisus that rest only is contrary to motion, & of GaSsendus about mo= tion natural & violent, Motus verus & Relativus of Newton & some others, as I shall observe. All  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  are most fas= tidiously accumulated in most philo= sophick discourses of our time.

The occasion of this prejudice against motion's being only a mode of body, is given by a mistaken sence of y<sup>e</sup> word motion,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is common speech is used subs

is used

20. The pre= judice oc= casioned by abuse of language

### Physica

(<del>40</del>) 20

is used substantively whereas it is an abstract word, w<sup>ch</sup> without a substance signifies no= thing; take  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  word instead of motion (in truth y<sup>e</sup> same) MovingneSs & all is set right; whoever said that falling was by a fallingneSs, or rising by a rising= neSs, or motive alterations by a moving= neSs? & is not that all one as by motion. But before we leave this subject, right must be done to  $S^{\rm r}$  I. Newton for he hath found out that ye constant re= ceSs & conatus of bodys from  $y^{\rm e}$  center of all compaSs movements is motus verus. And yet ye questions returns why, or whence is it derived? but of that afterwards & now to answer  $y^{\rm e}$ pretense it will be shewed among  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$ mechanicks, that bodys are actuated in that circumstance, that is turning, by y<sup>e</sup> same measures as take place upon all collision of bodys whatsoever.  $S^{\rm r}$ 

I Newton

Physica.

(41)

I. Newton had need of such a principle to poise his planetary orbs (to be con= sidered afterwards)  $w^{\rm ch},$  as he will have it, are conserved by two forces opposed, one is  $y^{\text{e}}$  centripetall &  $y^{\text{e}}$  other direct by tangents,  $y^{\rm e}$  latter producing  $y^{\rm e}$  Motus verus by ReceSs, & if  $y^e\,$  former shou'd be a reall principle, & as  $y^e\,$  latter only a meer relation (that is nothing at all) there woud rise an objection as of something & nothing acting counter. But why others, Especially  $y^e$  Mecha= nicall gentlemen, shou'd espouse y<sup>e</sup> fond notion, of  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  it will be shewed there is no need, I can by no means understand. If we are to define mo= tion according to what we know of it, there can be no distinction, but we must allow that it is as we per= ceive of it, & not any thing else that cannot be perceived, & who ever cou'd perceive y<sup>e</sup> verus distinct from Rela/tivus\. Here/Of\

### Of Plenitude & Vacuity

Here I find my self pusht upon another mat= ter of controversy,  $w^{\rm ch}$  hath exercised  $y^{\rm e}$  na= turalists in all gages, & that is if yethere is or may be in  $y^{\rm e}$  world a pure vacu= um, or space absolutely void of body; I shall not collect all ye chiccane that is to be found about this dispute, but only touch some principall matters, & having exprest what I think of ye ques= tion give  $y^{\rm e}$  reasons as clearly as I can. What y<sup>e</sup> ancients thought comes to no= thing, for their argument against va= cuity from suction is dissolved by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ Torrecellian experiment, 33 wch hath disco= vered  $y^e$  cause of that effect to proceed from  $y^{\rm e}$  weight of  $y^{\rm e}$  Atmosphear, & not from fuga vacui;<sup>34</sup> & further that Suc= tion working beyond ye power of such

preSsure

21.
Against
y<sup>e</sup> supposi=
tion of va=
cuity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Evangelista Torricelli (1608-1647), Italian physicist and mathematician, student of Galileo, and inventor of the barometer. The barometer is in fact 'the experiment'; for us the barometer measures air pressure, when invented (in 1643) it demonstrated that the atmosphere actually had weight. The vacuum is formed between the mercury and the sealed end of the glass tube.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> i.e., 'flight from vacuum', i.e., that nature abhors a vacuum. Torricelli's barometer demonstrated that it was not some 'tendency' in nature, but simply the weight, or pressure of the atmosphere, which caused air to rush in and fill a vacuum.

### Physica

(43)

preSsure, when vacuity seems to appear as in y<sup>e</sup> mercuriall space derelicted, & all long tubes. It is not purely such, but Repleat with more minute parts, to  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  $y^{\text{e}}$  veSsel or tube is permeable; So  $y^{\text{e}}$  dis= pute falls between  $y^{\rm e}$  Cartesians & New= tonians; Cartes thought that vacuity was impoSsible, for body & space were one &  $y^{\rm e}$  same thing, Because we had  $y^{\rm e}$  like Idea of both, that is extension, & no o= ther, & more of, either we know not. The Newtonians, who seem instituted in  $[\hdotseem]$  af [---?]fected opposition to  $y^e$  Newtoni/Cartesi\ans, al= ledg that there is no cogency in that ar= gument, for consistent with extension, there may be other propertys[;?] And they [..?] hold that empty space not only may be but actually is  $y^e$  case of  $y^e$  great hollow of  $y^{\text{e}}$  universe,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is pure & pute vacuity, Except a few clodds swimming in it called starrs or planets. But this seems

Physica (44) 22

seems a very violent supposition; for how shoud Light & heat be communicated through vacuity? And it hath great similitude with y<sup>e</sup> Aristotelian princi= ple of privation;<sup>35</sup> however it is hard to admitt vacuity for a principle of w<sup>ch</sup> thin such large extent, there neither is, or can be any proof, & our senses make no discovery but of plenum.

2.2.
Plenitude
{\_}demonstrated

Des Cartes says that if nothing{ be}tween  $y^e \{\underline{two}\}$  sides of a veSsel, they must touch. The Newtonians say /deride\ that, and say there is empty space between; This lett's me in to shew  $y^e$  side I take, & that will be with  $y^e$  cartesians, so farr as to think that bo= dy is space, & space body, & equally impe= netrable, w<sup>ch</sup> admitted there can be no ab= solute vacuity. They say that empty space may be between  $y^e$  two sides of a veSsel, so that they shall not touch, Then it is granted that such space is something & not

 $<sup>^{35}</sup>$  Aristotle srets up his theory of change near the beginning of Book I of The Physics, in part 7. Privation is the absence of form, or matter, and is therefore a lack of either, offering the possibility of becoming either.

## (45) Physica

{_}}	not merum nihil, <sup>36</sup> for then $y^e$ Cartesian inference $wo{ud}$ be too hard for them, since touching & having nothing between is all one. Then if space be something,
{_}}	have, so that of the two spaces $\{ \underline{on} \}$ is not y <sup>e</sup> same as y <sup>e</sup> other, but both are beings subsistent apart from each other s
{_}}	cannot be m/m\{a}de one; as y <sup>e</sup> space of Trin: College Library is one, & that of y <sup>e</sup> College Hall another, as distinct as
{_}}	$y^e$ Library { $\underline{\&}$ } Hall are twain, $\underline{\&}$ to say that one may be moved $\underline{\&}$ put into $y^e$ other, is to speak against $y^e$ common no= tion of things, $\underline{\&}$ may be said of body as well as of space. And $y^e$ case will be $y^e$ same if any one space be devided into parts as Cubick feet, one part is
{_}}	not y <sup>e</sup> same, & cannot be made y <sup>e</sup> same as any other part, w{ <u>here</u> }by two spaces of each one [?]foot shall become one Space & be no

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 36}$  i.e., 'mere nothing'.

{\_}}

Physica (46) 23

& be no more extended: And what is this but impenetrability? {<u>th</u>}ere y<sup>e</sup> space & y<sup>e</sup> mat= ter contained in it are one & y<sup>e</sup> same & constitute y<sup>e</sup> same substance we call body It was noted That some expect a discovery what is y<sup>e</sup> intrinsick nature of body, is it not as proper to ask what is y<sup>e</sup> intrin= sick nature of vacuity or /empty\ space? The witt of man can find nothing to answer but that w<sup>ch</sup> equally & alike exists, or Resides in both, as being all that is knowable of either. viz. Extension.

But all this while we fight against a prejudice almost invincible, w<sup>ch</sup> ari= seth from y<sup>e</sup> common notice of veSsels, that contain matter not directly sen= sible, & therefore <u>are stiled empty</u>. No= thing can eradicate this Idea of em= ptyneSs, for whatever is alledg{<u>e</u>} a sup= posall will remove it, as that y<sup>e</sup> veSsell is full of water, then suppose y<sup>e</sup> water taken out, t is full of air, They'l

this pre= judice for vacuum.

Whence

23.

{\_}

{\_}}

(47) Physica

further say{\_}take out  $y^e$  air,& so by a perpetuall negatioon, ye same Idea will be susteined, & for fail, recurr to an al= mighty power to evacuate a veSsel of all kind of body; & say suppose it so,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  answer must be as that of a gunner who upon a supposall was urged by a great Lord to say, how far a gun five miles long wou'd carry, his an= swer was that by G...d he would not suppose it. Wee are not to argue from our Ideas,  $w^{\rm ch}$  are for  $y^{\rm e}$  most part, as to y<sup>e</sup> nature of things, that have no con= nexion or to do with them, very de= ceiptfull. Nor may we accuse provi= dence, for permitting such Ideas to seem clear & yet (as above) be false,  $y^{\text{e}}$ same say they as deluding us; w<sup>ch</sup> is not so; for  $y^e$  Ides are certeinly /&\ true as they seem, but our judgement & inferences are untrue, & so we decieve our selves; as for y<sup>e</sup> most part we do when we

have

## Physica (48) 24

have nothing better to alledge than that wee can or cannot conceive it. As for y<sup>e</sup> conceipts that without vacuity there coud be no fluidity, motion & plight, or sound in y<sup>e</sup> world, y<sup>e</sup> vanity of them will be exposed when we come a= mongst y<sup>e</sup> mechanicks, & in other pla= ces where such matters may properly be Canvased.

### Of Time.

The same shop out of which came y<sup>e</sup> distinction of motus verus, & Relativus hath sent out another in company, not unlike, that is of tempus absolutum, & tempus Relativum. The latter is meant of our common accounts of time by Revolutions & Horloges, w<sup>ch</sup> (its said) are Inequable, incertein, & not commensurable. But time it self or absolute time flows (as they say) e= quably for ever, & such as must be

admitted

24 Like dis= tinction of time absolute & relative Physica

(49)

admitted to exist, altho  $y^{\rm e}$  whole universe were annihilated, Styling it fore, & af= ter, Duration, and  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  like Synonimes, that all signifie y<sup>e</sup> same thing, as doth y<sup>e</sup> single nominative, time. And so it seems  $y^{\rm e}$  thought is, that time (& I suppose  $y^{\rm e}$ like is affirmed of infinite space) is a being independent ein ye world, & all its materialls, & phaenomena; & never having had a beginning, will have no end, but must exist Deo volente vell no= lente.  $^{\rm 37}$  If I mistake  $y^{\rm e}$  sence, or Conse= quence of this distinction, I beg par= don, but hope when I have done with  $y^{\rm e}$  subject, some colour for these in= ferences may appear, therefore I pro= ceed to expose my notions of time.

It must be considered either according to  $y^e$  Idea or sence we have of it, or else as it is to found in  $y^e$  world, If all thinking beings were annihilated; as if there never had been such. The

former

25. Whence y<sup>e</sup> Idea of conti= nuation or time.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> i.e., 'whether God wills it nor not'

former I call y<sup>e</sup> Interior Idea of time, w<sup>ch</sup> consists of sensations & reflections with varietys following so fast, that distinction failing, all run together & make y<sup>e</sup> Idea of a continuation. And { $\underline{\&}$ } of that y<sup>e</sup> modes are so variable, & uncertain, that without a reference to exterior Cronometers, there wou'd be scarce a sence of time, but it

(<del>50</del>) 25

reference to exterior Cronometers, there wou'd be scarce a sence of time, but it woud be drowned, in y<sup>e</sup> Ease, disease, or a meer perception of our existence. For appealing to y<sup>e</sup> Cronometers, we find that attention, study (w<sup>ch</sup> are almost in y<sup>e</sup> pow we of y<sup>e</sup> will) Ease & pleasure make y<sup>e</sup> time seem short; Whence M<sup>r</sup> Fairfax<sup>38</sup> in= ferred that a being perfectly happy cou'd not be sensible of time. And on y<sup>e</sup> other side pain, y<sup>e</sup> absence or expectation of good things, makes y<sup>e</sup> time seem long; And in sleep or trance it is nothing at all. So that time, of w<sup>ch</sup> we have inter/nally\ no

25r

{\_}}

(51) \_ Physica  $\{\underline{n}\}$ o Criterium, is a meer chimera, & per= {\_}} takes of no existence, or principle of naturall things, more than our other Cogitations or Imaginations. And our Re=  $\{\underline{f}\}\texttt{erence t}\{\underline{o\ t}\}\texttt{hings}$  without us for  $y^e$  charac= {\_}}  $\{\underline{t}\} \texttt{er} \text{ of } t\{\underline{\texttt{hing}}\}\texttt{s} \text{ without us for } y^{\texttt{e}} \text{ character}$ of times is arbitrarious, & may or may not be regarded, & within our selves there is no= thing that time shou'd relate to. 26. Time is Now abstracting all animall sensation, as if none such were, or ever had been in a compa= y<sup>e</sup> universe, what do we find there but rison of velocitys body &  $y^{\rm e}$  various shapes, mutations of posi= tions, &  $y^{\rm e}$  proper velocitys, all  $w^{\rm ch}$  are com= parable, but that only by measures of extensions? I shoud be glad to be adver= tised of any other ESsence, or principle coordinate with these; Animall sensati= {\_}} on {()of which I have given an account only excepted?{)}, w<sup>ch</sup> was before withdrawn,

that

{\_}}

{\_}}

Physica <del>52</del>.26

that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  Idea of time at large in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  world might be more incomplex & limpid. But now to abstract further this whole state of body & its modes & velocitys, What Re= mains then? they will say time, & what is that? a thing that flows equably? So flowing equably is y<sup>e</sup> thing that flows equably.  $B{\underline{u}}$ t then there is faster & slower, & what is ye standard, with wch a comparison may be made? Motion hath some station supposed, but{\_}station hath time? By this one may perceive that this Idea of tempus absolutum, volens nolens,  $^{\rm 39}$  hath reference to  $y^{\rm e}$  matter of  $y^{\rm e}$ world  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  imagination will affix to it; Therefore this stubborn notion is Groun= ded upon nothing else but upon our Idea of time w<sup>ch</sup> they call relative, both Ideas Relative & absolute /in us\ being  $\underline{y}^{e}\text{one}$ &  $y^{\rm e}$  same, &  $y^{\rm e}$  inequallity & incommen/surability of

<sup>39</sup> i.e., 'will you won't you'.

{⊥ ⊥}⁴⁰

{\_}

27. Vacuity of body hath sen= sible re= presenta= tions but non time none.

### (53) Physica

of velocitys, is all one as of magnitudes, of w<sup>ch</sup> all proportions are poSsible. And as those are defined only by compa= rison so as each part is a standard of all y<sup>e</sup> rest, as y<sup>e</sup> parts happen to deno= minate each other to be great, small, or equall, so time that is no more e= quiable than magnitude, can be in measure defined no otherwise than as noted periods of moving matter make a distinction. So that Equabillity of time abstractedly{<sub>L</sub>} seems a meer Chi= mera.

The only argument (after these abstrac= tions) insisted on, is that we cannot con= ceive it should be poSsible for time to cease, as if our imaginations were a certain criterium of truth, touching y<sup>e</sup> ESsence of things out of all reach of sence, or experiment, & whereof no connexion

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 40}$  A vertical pencil line at this point.

## Physica (<del>5</del>4) 27

connexion can be made appear. This on like occasion was answered before. And now to conclude. I have often reflected upon a disparity in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  way of some mens thinking, viz: that an absolute vacuity shou'd not only be conjectured as in na= ture poSsible, but affrmed by wholesale & made a principle in a spacious hypothesis of nature; And then if one ventures to suppose that a vacation of time in case all ye materiall world was annihilated wou'd  $b\{\underline{e_{\ell}}\}$  then: The same persons Reluct, & say this tempus abso= lutum is of neceSsary existence, & cannot be abstracted or annihilated. It seem  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ inducement to this unequall thinking, is because there are images of vacuity by means of veSsels called empty: These are continually occurrent to sense, Where= of y<sup>e</sup> Ideas without violent Abstraction, cannot

{\_}

## Physica.

{\_} cannot be del{e}ted. But there neither is nor can be any sensible image of non time; And during sleep or trance when {\_} as to all knowledge y<sup>e</sup> time paSsing {<u>is</u>}

55.

{\_}

time; And during sleep or trance when as to all knowledge  $y^e$  time paSsing {<u>is</u>} nothing, upon Revivall there is (in a way of history) a recourse to externall Revolutions & Horologes for making good ye account; therefore it is no wonder that y<sup>e</sup> mind having no previous example {or} or impreSsion, hath no power to conceive that time shall be no more. The pre= judice ariseth from deferring too much to  $\ensuremath{\mbox{our}}$  imagination,  $y^e$  is but a copy of things, & what things are not copyable as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  true principles of nature, we must come at them by means of reiterated sensations, & Rationall conclusions there= upon; beyond w<sup>ch</sup> all that imagination can pretend too, will be ranked under no other claSsis but that of Dreams. of

## Physica 56.28

### Of Force.

There is another Idea imbibed from ordinary recurrences in  $y^{\rm e}$  world,  $w^{\rm ch}$  ac= cording to  $y^{\text{e}}$  truth of things is seldom justly understood, and this is called  $\underline{force}$  of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}\ y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  true esteem or measure is compound of quantity moving, & swiftneSs of acceSs, of w<sup>ch</sup> more elsewhere; At present we only reflect upon certain prejudices &  $y^{\rm e}$  useleSs applications of that word; we are sensible of our own wills,  $\mbox{\tt \&}$  there= under of a power to compell, or (when Subject{)} to be compelled, & also of  $y^e$ niceneSs of our senses, & tenderneSs of our bodys; And from anthence are fear= full of attaques, as may bring pain, & destruction. These sentiments induce an Imaginative Idea of force, supposing it to include somewhat like  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  efficacy of our

{\_}}

(57.)

### Physica

of our members when we are disposed to use them for offence, or defence, per= suant to the determination of our wills, without any regard to mechanicks, but as a consequence of active life. All  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$ imaginations differr much from a true notion of force in inanimate things. And in our late poeticall philosophy, ye word force or in Latin #Vis, is used in y<sup>e</sup> same manner & like signification as among  $y^{\rm e}$  ancients  $y^{\rm e}$  word quallity, & bating  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  charm of a learned language, (but rendered) power or force woud not do neer so well. As for example we can rellish y<sup>e</sup> words, vis Attractiva, Centripe= ta, Centrifugo, Resistentiae, Inertiae & some others, & swallow them for princi= ples affording clever solutions of diverse capitall phaenomena. But these in plain English wou'd sound odly & not be so

28v

29r

	Physica ( <del>58</del> ) 29
{_}}	be so readily admitted as $/^{2}^{42}$ a force to draw, to centreseek, to centerfly, to Resist or to be quasi dull, or lazy & y <sup>e</sup> like; all w <sup>ch</sup> may serve even as /well as\ y <sup>e</sup> others, to barr further enguirys. But y <sup>e</sup> vain amusement
[.?]41	of y <sup>e</sup> [ <b>vires</b> ]definitions by y <sup>e</sup> vires will be fur= ther exposed afterwards: We allow no natural force but what falls out u=
{_}}	<pre>pon collision of bodys, &amp; Renounce all those ColoSsian structures [hicht upon?]w<sup>ch</sup> are erec= ted upon y<sup>e</sup> vires, &amp; such (however y<sup>e</sup> matter is minced) are no better than (in English) quallitys long since seclu=</pre>
	<pre>ded out of y<sup>e</sup> philosophick schools. I believe he that said, that altho y<sup>e</sup> phae= nomena of nature were caused by attraction, pulsion or any /other\ unknown cause, his demonstrations grounded upon y<sup>e</sup> vires wou'd hold, was pleased with y<sup>e</sup> subterfuge</pre>
	Subterruge

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 41}$  An editorial mark or symbol looking like a 'y', with a short tail to the right.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 42}$  A small, pencil-drawn shape above the word.

(59) Physica

subterfuge, altho few will think y<sup>e</sup> con= clusion undenyable, or y<sup>e</sup> premises be= ing unknown better than Gratis dicta.<sup>43</sup>

 $^{\rm 43}$  A statement freely, or voluntarily given, but meaning also 'so he says'.

<unnumbered page>

Physica (60)

<unnumbered page>

(61.) Physica

30r

29.
Ordina=
ry terms
referring
to impul=
{\_} ses to be
used.

Physica (<del>62</del>) 30

# Rules of impulses.

In order to proceed further in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  theory of impulsive motion, for want of more artificiall terms apt for  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  purpose: I must{\_}y<sup>e</sup> forms of common speech, & o{ $\underline{r}$ } dinary words such as force, violence, strength, weakneSs, advance, accede, de= part, follow, or y<sup>e</sup> like, but allways with a reserve upon occasion for redu= cing y<sup>e</sup> mNotions to y<sup>e</sup> standard of motion already declared. And in this inquest I propose to touch upon all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}\xspace$  modes of percuSsive force, Mechanicall pow= ers & some more complicate Energys; And not to be incumbred with objec= tions too soon. I shall at present, as before, waive plenitude, & borrow a portion of  $y^{\rm e}$  supposed vacuity, & abstract all mediall (63) Physica

all mediall resistances, till I shall have opportunity to shew that motion by im= pulse in fluido will be subject to y<sup>e</sup> same rules as in vacuo; & then we may hope to bring y<sup>e</sup> various modes of per= cuSsion with y<sup>e</sup> antecedents & consequen= ces under some rule with competent per= spicuity. But with precaution, that how= ever our dealing is formall, by proposi= tions as Mathematicians use, y<sup>e</sup> discourse will be physicall, not pretending to strickt demonstration, all w<sup>ch</sup> is left to y<sup>e</sup> profeSsors.

We are now in view of a campane repleat with variety of modes under w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> many sorts of impulses are to be considered, & that will require y<sup>e</sup> using some terms, perhaps not common & if those are not

a little

29<sup>2</sup>. account of some terms. Physica (64) 31

a little explained, y<sup>e</sup> campane may turn to a wilderneSs; therefore I shall pre= mise somewhat of that kind, w<sup>ch</sup> I think may aSsist y<sup>e</sup> following propositions.

Impulse is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  occurse or contact of bodys moving.

The direction of a moving body is  $y^{\rm e}$  path of its center.

The line of acceSs is  $y^e$  direction before  $y^e$  impulse, &  $y^e$  line of separation or departure is that after  $y^e$  impulse, & may be understood of  $y^e$  one or other of  $y^e$  collisors, or both.

A Regular or direct impulse is when  $y^e$  directions of both bodys fall upon  $y^e$  same line as of globes. A, & B.  $y^e$  line a, b. being  $y^e$  direction of both as well after  $y^e$  acceSs aSs before.

An obliq impulse of such regulars, is when

Physica

65

when it falls otherwise as from E &  $y^{\rm e}$  angle C  $_{\ell}$  A  $_{\ell}$  D. is  $y^{\rm e}$  angle of obliqui=ty.

If both are movent in severall directi= ons there is obliquity in both as of A. by y<sup>e</sup> direction CA, y<sup>e</sup> angle of obli= quity bAC. & of B by y<sup>e</sup> direction EB y<sup>e</sup> angle of obliquity is DBE. Plus minus.

A body regular impelled upon a dia meter or a point having <u>{ind}</u>ifferent or uniform respect to all y<sup>e</sup> parts, is a direct impulse, otherwise obliq, viz: (a) Direct. (b) oblique.

Contingent impulses of irregular bo= dys of  $w^{ch} y^e$  common matter of  $y^e$  world consists are mostly on both sides oblig as at c.

For w<sup>ch</sup> reason in calculating y<sup>e</sup> events of impulses, Substances, form, & direction, with

31v

{\_}

## Physica (<del>66</del>) 32

with some other circumstances must be given, y<sup>ch</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> art Statick, whereof y<sup>e</sup> principles will be found in y<sup>e</sup> follow= ing propositions. But going off from Regulars, that is to contingent impul= ses, y<sup>e</sup> events are so perplext that few, Even y<sup>e</sup> great Geometer himself hath declined to enter into y<sup>e</sup> consideration of them. What is meant by Equallity or indifference of respects, is to come from y<sup>e</sup> Mechanicks.

1 All cases of impulses will be com be comprised under y<sup>e</sup> consideration of t of two bodys only viz A impell= lent & B impelled.

For all contact is understood to be by points, if superficies convex or plano convex occurr y<sup>e</sup> touch is by a point If flat or any paralell superficies con/curr\ then

30. Impulses by points

### Physica

(64)

then y<sup>e</sup> center point of such contingent superficies, as to all efficacy, is y<sup>e</sup> point of y<sup>e</sup> contact, for every way y<sup>e</sup> effect is ba= lanced, & if two or more oContacts hap= pen at y<sup>e</sup> same instant, y<sup>e</sup> medium point of all is y<sup>e</sup> point of contact, & y<sup>e</sup> consequence is ruled accordingly.

31. Recipro= call Re= lation

32. Station fixed as resting. 2. All relations in y<sup>e</sup> universe, as to y<sup>e</sup> motions of A & B Except of each to y<sup>e</sup> other (or as p next) are to be layd aside, as if none such were.

For Distances, aspects, & directions, are jud= ged fby  $y^{\rm e}$  bodys respected, & not otherwise.

3. In order to fix a state of im= pulses, it is neceSsary that some= what shou'd be supposed immove= able, & that commonly falls out to be y<sup>e</sup> station of y<sup>e</sup> observer.

For if regard is had to other bodys or systems of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  world that may appear

as

Physica

as moving,  $y^e$  rule & cnaracters of  $y^e$  mo= tion Respected will be confounded. And it cannot be determined, whether A or B moves or how. Therefore when we referr to  $y^e$  station or (for reasons as will be given) to  $y^e$  point or place of contact, of w<sup>ch</sup> either is supposed to be fixed & determined,  $y^e$  motion is de= clared.

33. No conti= nuance in y<sup>e</sup> con= tact  A & B cannot continue in y<sup>e</sup> Contact but eo instante<sup>44</sup> must separate.

This is not according to  $y^e$  late cant, vis resistendi but (if vis must be in  $y^e$ case) impenetrabilitatis; And in truth it is not in A nor in B but in both, Each alike (by  $y^e$  inconsistency) forced from  $y^e$  other, for as to that purpose each is impellent & impelled, w<sup>ch</sup> con= sidered there is no need to differr about  $y^e$  34. Separations direct & not curve  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  modes of expreSsion.

5 When A or B move from y<sup>e</sup> con= tact, it shall be direct by strait lines, & not by any curve what= soever.

For infinite curves may be co-tangent at one & y<sup>e</sup> same point, as in y<sup>e</sup> figure, & nothing is found by way of cause to determine  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  shall be taken, therefore  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  direction shall be indifferent, that is strait. If a body be diverted from that towards a curve, it must by me/ans\ of further impulse, & then  $y^{\rm e}$  same con= sequence returns, & so continually till it is free, & then at that instant, it takes a strait course, &  $y^{\rm e}$  moment of parting is an impulse, & What of course follows. A further reason may be, that in all curvity  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  exterior surface move faster than y<sup>e</sup> interior or concave;  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  in a momentary action will not succeed; And in such case all  $y^{\rm e}$ 

parts

34r

Physica

(<del>70</del>) 34

parts of y<sup>e</sup> body being close united, will affect each other quasi by impulse, till by inciting & retarding they will paSs equally; what may be y<sup>e</sup> case upon turning will be considered afterwards.

6 The modes of bodys (no more than y<sup>e</sup> substances) will not alter with= out a cause efficient.

This is common notion & grounded on exp= rience constant & universall; Hence it is concluded that a state of approach or departure must cont\*/in\ue till some competent power effects a change w<sup>ch</sup> can be no other than y<sup>e</sup> occurse of bo= dy, with with/c<sup>h</sup>\ a continuance is incom= patible; this is y<sup>e</sup> only cause why a bo= dy moves after y<sup>e</sup> moving force with= drawn.

7. Motion & rest are allwaiys referred to some fixt place else y<sup>e</sup> relation is to

35. Modes not change without some ef= ficient cause

36 Motion de= termined by some fixt place

## (71.) Physica

is to all things ad libitum & vagum<sup>45</sup> &
 all that belongs to motion speci=
 fically stands; undetermined.
 v.<sup>46</sup> before N°. 3.

When A & B approach or separate, who can say whither one, other, or both move, but by reference to something of w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> place is supposed to be fixt? & that depriving y<sup>e</sup> arbitrary relation to other things in y<sup>e</sup> world, gives an Idea of y<sup>e</sup> locallity of moving bodys. And such as make no change at all with this fixation are said to rest, o= therwise to be in motion; & perhaps that very fixation (as may be presumed) changeth in other respects & then all is loose again.

8 All space is reall & depends on no relation, & upon collision, y<sup>e</sup> point of contact being momentary is fixed, & y<sup>e</sup> states antecedent & con= sequent may be referred to that, & delineated accordingly: & we may

term

37. point of contact fixt & also some station

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 45}$  i.e., 'optional and undefined'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> i.e., '*vide*' - i.e., 'see above, No. 3'.
Physica (<del>72</del>) 35

term it  $y^{\rm e}$  contact, or station promi= cuously both in effect meaning  $y^{\rm e}$  same thing.

As for example two shipps in y<sup>e</sup> wide sea fall foul, The motions of them more undefined & accountable by re= lation to y<sup>e</sup> heaven's, y<sup>e</sup> sea, or y<sup>e</sup> soyl, or otherwise at pleasure; but y<sup>e</sup> place of y<sup>e</sup> touch is momentaneous, & fixed with respect to y<sup>e</sup> whole world. And is to be taken as a center /to &\ from w<sup>ch</sup> all impulsive directions are describable, & so taken as a station of an observer (or any other place fixed with respect to that.) projects a certeinty of any mo= tion & all its modes. Motion is Relative but Impulse is not.

37<sup>2</sup>. Velocity of acceSs & separa= tion equall except &c.

35r

	(73)	Physica	
	<b>velocity</b> velocity eq	uall to that of y <sup>e</sup> acceSs.	
	As when B is e The velocitys is to create w leSs, for that This rule hold but only when & then B will is y <sup>e</sup> utmost an A. following u locity of that y <sup>e</sup> other, accord	quall to, or exceeds A. cannot be more, for that hat is not, it cannot be sinks past into nothing. s in all cases whatever A. is greater than B take y <sup>e</sup> full velocity, w <sup>ch</sup> ny impulse can give. And pon y <sup>e</sup> same line, y <sup>e</sup> ve= must be subducted from rding to y <sup>e</sup> proportion of y <sup>e</sup>	
37.	10 1 - 5	shall also in so alsos of	
<del>37</del> Equalls change states	B. & that s velocity.	snall stop in y <sup>e</sup> place of hall move with y <sup>e</sup> same	
	This is y <sup>e</sup> case one equall to bodys chaged s tion [changed	e of a leSs body falling upon it & is just as if y <sup>e</sup> two tates, & y <sup>e</sup> velocity or mo= <b>states</b> ]seemed continued as y <sup>e</sup>	same with/out

interruption

35v

Dr Clerk in trans:47 Physica (74) 36

interruption at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  contact; And in rea= son & experiment ye consequence is veri= fyed. There is equall reason of change in both, therefore  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  change in both must be equall; & one resting, &  $y^{\rm e}$  other moving from rest to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same velocity, is equall change. A certain philosopher with his usuall opiniatrete  $^{48}$  says A shall [refelct?] with 1/2 & ye other move 1/2  $y^{\rm e}$  velocity, not to considering that to stopp & reflect A, is much greater change than to move B into 1/2 ye velo= city. The game called shuffleboard proves this event, & billiards wou'd do  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same, but for rolling. Many equalls (sans Friction) neer in y<sup>e</sup> same line, y<sup>e</sup> first impelled shall send the impulse through all ye rest, wch accounts for ye equabillity of watery waves dilating.

A leSs

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> Jean le Clerc (1657-1736), a Swiss theologian and scholar, published his *Physica, sive de rebus corporeis libri quinque* in Amsterdam in 1696. Le Clerc had been in London during the most turbulent months of the Exclusion Crisis in 1682, moving to Amsterdam where he became a close associate of John Locke (he was later his biographer). He would therefore be considered by the Norths to be neither a theological, philosophical nor political friend.

	(75)
<pre>39. Velocitys of greater &amp; leSs as quantitys.</pre>	11. A. leSs than B. they shall divide at y <sup>e</sup> contact & move in oppo= site directions, & y <sup>e</sup> velocity be distributed as y <sup>e</sup> quantitys, in proportion the greater having y <sup>e</sup> leSs share.
{_}}	$\{ \frac{\text{Stet.}}{\text{Stet.}} \}$ A shall reflect, to a contrary di rection, with 1/2 velocity & B shall pro= ceed with y <sup>e</sup> other half. So A = 4B shall reflect with 3/4 & B proceed with 1/4 of y <sup>e</sup> velocity. And so quantity & space rule y <sup>e</sup> effects of all impulses. <sup>6 49</sup>
{_}}	These cases require y <sup>e</sup> bodys to be Ada= mantine & not yielding or springy in y <sup>e</sup> least, for that is an operation of compound matter, & in all degrees uncertain. The french author in his choq du Corps <sup>50</sup> ascribes eElasticity, {()as a principle

 $<sup>^{49}</sup>$  '6' here in superscript might refer us back to note/rule 6 above on fol. 34r. (i.e., 'The modes of bodys (no more than  $y^{\rm e}$  substances) will not alter without a cause efficient.').

{\_}}

{\_}}

Physica (<del>76</del>) 37

principle,  $\{\}$  to all body whatsoever & thereby, pretends to solve all  $y^e$  effects of percuSsion; but allows that bodys may be springs infinitely strong [in= finitely strong], & what is that but Ada= mantine, w<sup>ch</sup> falls into our rules, & /[...?]\ {those} /[...?]^52springineSs disturbes? By y<sup>e</sup> proposition here of A more than B &  $y^e$  velocity parted as y<sup>e</sup> disproportion inverted. It appears that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  result of a leSs body from a greater, w<sup>t</sup>ever y<sup>e</sup> dis= proportion is, cannot be with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  full velocity absolutely. Hence it follows that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  least thing with Observat= {\_}tions par= y<sup>e</sup> l{<u>east</u>} velocity, <u>moves y<sup>e</sup> greatest</u> in part 20.51 some measure, & however small it is somewhat, for of time, or velocity there is not found a minimum, no more than of body or space; And we are not to start when it is affirmed that y<sup>e</sup> fall

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Here, and over leaf ('par: 22') MN?RN seem to be referring to Newton's Principia - although I have yet to satisfy myself exactly where. The obvious reference here is to the Principia, Definitiones III: 'Materiæ vis insita est potentia resistendi, etc.'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> Word 'those' crossed out, and illegible comments inserted, in pencil.

(77)

v. par: 22

 $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fall of a Tennis ball moves  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole terraqueous globe; & this immensity of disproportion I shall afterwards have occasion to call an infinite resistance. We find in  $S^{\rm r}$  Is: Newtons principia a definition of body by a vis insita resistendi; & why not vis impellendi^{53} /w^{ch} is  $\$  as real as y<sup>e</sup> other? These definitions by y<sup>e</sup> vires are but affirmations, w<sup>ch</sup>, ha= ting ye Logicalia,54 are better [expresse]known by a common way of expreSsion. As, is it not as intelligible to say impene= trabilis, as vis impenetrabilitatis?<sup>55</sup> In another place we find - Quantum in se est, as if  $y^{\rm e}$  thing were alive & strove to prevail; if y<sup>e</sup> sence is is quan= tum substantiae, 56 we are agreed. In phy= sicks y<sup>e</sup> definitions shou'd be ex natura rei,  $^{\rm 57}$  & not, as in Mathematicks, circum/scriptive  $\$ only

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 53}$  i.e., 'an innate force of resistance' and 'an impelled force'.

 $<sup>^{54}</sup>$  i.e., the volumes of scholastic Logic, existing in many editions from the thirteenth century onwards, usually known as the 'parva logicalia'.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 55}$  i.e., 'the impenetrable force', and 'the force of impenetrability'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> i.e., 'in and of itself', and 'amount of substance'.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 57}$  i.e., 'things actually existing', 'reality'.

only. Vis is a physicall term & {()abstrac= ted;{)} of universal signification, w<sup>ch</sup> wants to be defined or naturally ex= plained, as much as any other, & with out such intelligences y<sup>e</sup> science of naturall philosophy failes.

There is also a specious axiom - Ubi percuSsio ibi repercuSsio,<sup>58</sup> whereof y<sup>e</sup> matter in effect is true, but is is Ae= nigmatically exprest, as if it were intended to offuscate rather than to proffer any clear notion, for Re= percuSsio seems to imply activity as of a spring, & in that sence y<sup>e</sup> axiom is not true; the just signification is of [body]y<sup>e</sup> common inconsistency of bodys meeting in y<sup>e</sup> insy<sup>e</sup>tant of contact, w<sup>ch</sup> produceth a separation, not by per= cuSsio, or repercuSsio but by ConcuSsio whereof

{\_}

38r

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 58}$  i.e., 'where there is percussion there is repercussion'.

{<u>lazy=</u>}

whereof y<sup>e</sup> effect is not divided, but is one only resulting from an united neceSsity, acting ad modum Substantia= rum.<sup>59</sup>

(79)

The like is to be observed of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  chimeriq conceipt of Vis Inertiae, 60 wch is an insen= sible expreSion; & it is not true of any body to say it is iners, for besides y<sup>e</sup> re= ference to active life,  $\mathbf{w}^{\mathrm{ch}}$  is by no means proper (for what is  $y^e$  Idea of  $\{\underline{laz}\}i=$ neSs to  $y^{\rm e}$  mechanick effects) All bodys are more adequately reputed active. And ye larger more so, than ye leSs, & on either side  $y^{\rm e}$  conforming to ne= ceSsity is paSs/i\o,61 but not inertia, w<sup>ch</sup> sup= poseth an aversion to comply, of  $w^{\rm ch}$ body is not guilty. But vis is a favou= rite term, & stands in  $y^{\rm e}$  formality of a definition of anything not understood or when

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> i.e., 'in the manner of substances'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> i.e., 'force of interia'; *iners/inertia* also means lazy, reluctant or idle, in latin.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 61}$  i.e., 'a passion', i.e., a positive force.

Physica

or when y<sup>e</sup> notions are concealed, & yet somewhat must be speciously held forth, tho' it is but Verba dare;<sup>62</sup> Here iss but a touch upon this sub= ject, perhaps, more may come after= wards, but now we proceed to some further rules of impulse.

12 When a greater body impells on leSs,  $y^e$  velocity of  $y^e$  sepa= ration shall be to that of  $y^e$  acceSs as  $y^e$  leSs body is to  $y^e$ greater {<u>as</u>} respec{<u>t</u>} o  $y^e$ . contact or station will declare.

As A = 1/2 B shall give B y<sup>e</sup> full ve= locity of y<sup>e</sup> acceSs, w<sup>ch</sup> is all that any impulse can give. for if B had mo= ved with such speed all contact had been avoided. And now A shall not

rest

41.
Greater
upon leSs
follows
with leSs
velocity
{<u>w<sup>ch</sup></u>}

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> i.e., 'a word given', i.e., a trick.

(81)

next at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  contact, as an equall wou'd, but it shall follow with a veocity propor= tionall with ye exceSs of substance, that is 1/2 & that substracted leavs [2/1]1/2 to y<sup>e</sup> separation, &  $y^{\rm e}$  like will hold in eve= ry other proportion, as  $y^{\rm e}$  expert may cal= culate. This rule woud be sensible in y<sup>e</sup> greatest as well as y<sup>e</sup> least dis= proportions, but y<sup>e</sup> mediall resistance getting y<sup>e</sup> better of y<sup>e</sup> leSs, y<sup>e</sup> greatest seems to carry it away before it in contiguity; This & diverse of  $y^{\rm e}$  follow= ing propositions may be groSsly ex= perimented of  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  afterwards, And in  $y^e$  mean time let it be considered { that } that all these actions & paSsions of bo= dy, as well regarding substance as ve= locity, will be found as was said, Re= gulated by measure of space & dimensions. 13. All

{\_}

40r

42. Like magni= tudes like ef= fects

43 Meeting adds ve= locity Physica (82) 40
13. All magnitudes in like proportion
have like proportion whatever y<sup>e</sup> ve=
locities, & however y<sup>e</sup> impulses happen.
As A = 2, 4, 6 or 8, /&c\ And B = 24, 8, 122, or
or 16. &c. impelling with any velocity
shall separate with y<sup>e</sup> same respec=
tively, & not varying on acco:t of y<sup>e</sup> dif=
ferent magnitudes, for all that may

14 Any 2 bodys meeting with divers velocitys is all one as if y<sup>e</sup> 2 velocitys were conjoy= ned, & either rested. Saving only y<sup>e</sup> direction w<sup>ch</sup> as well after as before will referr to y<sup>e</sup> station or contact, whereby all directions are declared.

be alledged of A = 2 B will be true

of 2A = 4B of  $y^e$  rest.

This

44. distances & aspects without contact nothing

### (83.) Physica.

This means as to measure of force,  $w^{ch}$ is y<sup>e</sup> celerity of y<sup>e</sup> congress, whither y<sup>e</sup> motion is assigned upon one, other, or both y<sup>e</sup> bodys. But then y<sup>e</sup> mode of y<sup>e</sup> access, being referred to y<sup>e</sup> sta= tion, that of y<sup>e</sup> separation will be so too; And as y<sup>e</sup> directions of y<sup>e</sup> for= mer may be various, those of y<sup>e</sup> lat= ter derived of them will vary accor= dingly. As more at large in y<sup>e</sup> next.

15. The direction of y<sup>e</sup> impellent is referred to y<sup>e</sup> station, before & after y<sup>e</sup> impulse, & untill im= pulse happens, The variation of distances & aspects, quoad y<sup>e</sup> bo= dys is merum nihil.<sup>63</sup>

This is self evident, for bodys that do not touch, are to each other as non

entitys

entitys. The ESsence of body (impenetr= ble) consists in tangibility, w<sup>ch</sup> deprived, body is no more; this setts aside y<sup>e</sup> ima= ginary attraction, w<sup>ch</sup> is both contrary to y<sup>e</sup> experimented existence of body, & not provable by any reall experim:<sup>t</sup> of w<sup>ch</sup> elsewhere.

16 The velocity as well as y<sup>e</sup> direc= tion of moving bodys stands also referred to y<sup>e</sup> point of <u>contact</u> or station; accordingly to w<sup>ch</sup> all circumstances are de= clared.

For laying aside y<sup>e</sup> station, or place of y<sup>e</sup> contact, y<sup>e</sup> motion in y<sup>e</sup> wide wor/ld\ capapbale of infinite relations is wholly undefined, & may be accounted as di= versly; But an impulse makes a fixa= tion, according to w<sup>ch</sup> all circumstances of y<sup>e</sup>

45. velocity referred to y<sup>e</sup> sta tion. 23.

46. Direction of y<sup>e</sup> im= pelled from all directions of y<sup>e</sup> im= pellent y<sup>e</sup> same.

<space for diagram?>

Physica

(85)

of y<sup>e</sup> bodys concerned are determined & may be described that is by lines eve= ry way as well to as from a center.

17 A Globe D.G. impelled at any point D from what region so= ever y<sup>e</sup> impulse comes directed, whether from C or from E shall move from y<sup>e</sup> contact all in one and y<sup>e</sup> same direction D, F, y<sup>e</sup> same will hold of y<sup>e</sup> cube H. I. parallelipipedon K. L. Ellipse M, N, or other regular body, so as y<sup>e</sup> impulse feels on y<sup>e</sup> extremity of a just diameter as in y<sup>e</sup> figure D.G.

> Here we begin with obliq impulses; & first that of y<sup>e</sup> acceSs; where= upon we hold as in y<sup>e</sup> proposition, & y<sup>e</sup> reason is, that y<sup>e</sup> contact is un/derstood\ to be

Physica (<del>86</del>) 42

to be a single & individual point,  $w^{ch}$ admitts no difference, from whence  $y^e$ impellent comes; Nothing is significant but  $y^e$  inconsistency at  $y^e$  contact  $w^{ch}$ being of moving bodys requires an im= mediate separation; And that after  $y^e$ impulse will be in such a manner as  $y^e$  state of  $y^e$  impelled shall require. So that upon every impulse there will be a mode of acceSs, & of  $y^e$  separation, according to circumstances always re= gular & constant in  $y^e$  effects.

18 All obliquitys of y<sup>e</sup> impulse inferr a diminution of y<sup>e</sup> force

For a better gage of y<sup>e</sup> obliquity, Sup= pose a plane AB <u>tangent at y<sup>e</sup> con=</u> <u>tact</u>, (y<sup>e</sup> plane represents y<sup>e</sup> contact point as to all poSsible obliquities as if it were extended in infinitum, or

were

47. obliquity is always a diminu= tion of force

(87) Physica

were  $y^e$  diameter of an hemisphear) &  $y^e$  several angles made with that plane, shew if  $y^e$  impulse be direct, or obliq, & in what degree. Coming at right angles C.D. is direct, & other= wise, as frome E it is obliq. And  $y^{\rm e}$ same force from E is weaker than it is from C as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  space ED is more than  $y^{\rm e}$  space C.D. for let  $y^{\rm e}$  impelent from C & from E be  $y^{\rm e}$  same as to quantity & velocity, C. will arrive at D sooner than  ${\tt E}$  therefore quoad  $y^{\tt e}$  impulse it moves swifter & so hath more force. And further if parting at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same time from C & E. If  $y^{\rm e}$  latter, E, is to arrive at D together with C at  $y^{\rm e}$  same in= stant, then E must have more velo= city as y<sup>e</sup> space E.D. is more than C.D. & by that (caeteris paribus{)}  $y^e$  forces will be equall

{\_}

Physica (88) 43

be equal; all w<sup>ch</sup> is apparent upon in= spection of y<sup>e</sup> diagram. Whereby it ap= pears that velocity at large & velocity of approach are different & not calcu= lated by y<sup>e</sup> same measure.

19 What in velocity of approach is lost by obliquity of y<sup>e</sup> acceSs, may {<u>by</u>} supplyed by quantity added in y<sup>e</sup> same proportion as before.

As for example. If E was greater than C as E.D, is more in length athan [E?].D. & y<sup>e</sup> velocitys y<sup>e</sup> same, y<sup>e</sup> effect of y<sup>e</sup> im= pulses wou'd be y<sup>e</sup> same. For velocity & quantity compensate each other. So that what ever a single substance will do wi[--?]th sing/doub\le velocity, a double sub= stance will do with single velocity. And when y<sup>e</sup> velocity of y<sup>e</sup> acceSs is reduced by obliquity (for E with like velocity

48
Velocity
(in acco<sup>t</sup>
of force)
{\_}is equallable by
quantity
& e con=
tra.

The di= rection of y<sup>e</sup> im= pelled y<sup>e</sup> same from all velocitys

50 Direction by a line from y<sup>e</sup> {\_} contact thro y<sup>e</sup> cen= ter of y<sup>e</sup> im= pelled. Physica

(89)

velocity as [b.?] approacheth  $y^e$  tangent plane AB. slower than C.) a due quantity ad= ded makes an equation of  $y^e$  force.

20. The direction of  $y^e$  impelled from  $y^e$  contact will be  $y^e$  same with whatsoever force  $y^e$  impellent strikes.

For  $y^e$  contact is a point, upon w<sup>ch</sup> all im= pulses as to  $y^e$  direction of  $y^e$  impelled, ad= mitts no variation, but whether  $y^e$  force comes one way or other,  $y^e$  impelled will take  $y^e$  same direction. And more or less in  $y^e$  degree of  $y^e$  force will not, there being no cause to vary it; but  $y^e$  direc= tion of  $y^e$  impelled will be ruled by cir= cumstances proper to itself.

21. Every impulse direct, or (on y<sup>e</sup> part of y<sup>e</sup> impellent) obliq shall cause y<sup>e</sup> impell{<u>ent</u>} to move in a direction by a line from y<sup>e</sup> contact to its center.

Here

Physica

Here note a distinction of obliquity on  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ part of  $y^{\rm e}$  impellent & on  $y^{\rm e}$  part of  $y^{\rm e}$ impelled  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  will be of much importance afterwards. At present, y<sup>e</sup> impulse is sup= posed to fall indifferently; that is, upon a diameter of a regular body impelled, as a Globe for instance,  $w^{ch}$  however touched shall paSs away by this rule as ye gamesters at billiards well know. For y<sup>e</sup> impellent influencing nothing, one way or other,  $y^{\rm e}$  substance of  $y^{\rm e}$  im= pelled must decide, & that will be in a direction  $\underline{w^{ch}}$  is indifferent to all  $y^e$ parts; y<sup>e</sup> force requires a separation, not of one or other part but of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole from  $y^e$  contact, & how tshould that be but by a line that paSseth both con= tact, & y<sup>e</sup> proper center?

So also

51. Like tho y<sup>e</sup> impulse be obliq upon y<sup>e</sup> impelled.

#### Physica

(91)

22 So also if  $y^e$  impulse happens to fall Besides  $y^e$  extremitys of  $y^e$ diameters. The<sup>64</sup> Rectilinear di= rection direction shall be by a line thro  $y^e$  just center of  $y^e$ impelled from  $y^e$  contact.

This is y<sup>e</sup> case of all irregular & ir= regularly impelled bodys, & it is easily imagined into what variety y<sup>e</sup> specu= lation will runn, & how hard it will be to gather into heaps any measure of conformitys, as may make it appear that any certain rule governs them all. But I hope I may distinguish enough to shew, that measures of Quantum & space, shall be that very aforesaid stated rule by w<sup>ch</sup> all mechanick ac= tion in y<sup>e</sup> word is governed. And here we find that upon all these oblique

impulses

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> There is some marking with the soft-leaded pencil here - it is not clear what is meant, it might be accidental marking, it might be related to the repetition of the word 'direction' in this and the following line.

Physica (<del>92</del>) 45

impulses, respecting y<sup>e</sup> quantity & direc= tion, there will be two effects, that is progreSsion & gyration; & before we apply to this proposition, we must ad= just some particular cases concerning that.

23 When any body turns round (being <u>{free</u>}) it shall turn upon a center or axis. And not with uncertainty, or shifting from one point or axis to another whatever y<sup>e</sup> form of it is.

This proposition is not easily proved by argumentation, because our principles are not so sensibly exposed, as to ground a firm demonstration upon. And it is scarce poSsible to make any experiment that shal clearly inferr it, or y<sup>e</sup> contrary. And so

52. Bodys tur= ning move on y<sup>e</sup> pro= {\_} per center or axis Physica

(93)

And so long as whe have a liberty to opine in such matters, & to sustain our opinion by discourse. I shall venture upon this point  $w^{ch}$  perhaps may be rendred more clear in what follows.

As upon impulses we take  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  point of contact, quoad  $y^e$  position, to be at that time fixed & determined with respect to all  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  world. So also we take all  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ points in that body to be in like man= ner as to position fixed & determined. And as y<sup>e</sup> impulse at y<sup>e</sup> contact exter= nally affects  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole by measure of substance & velocity; So also each other /part\ internally affects each other lying in continuall contact. And in Regard y<sup>e</sup> substance of those parts as all mo= menta must be understood to be equal, such affection must appear only in y<sup>e</sup> velocity. Now in all turning, Some part must

{\_}}

Physica (<del>91</del>) 46

move in larger arches, that is swifter, & some slower than others, but from y<sup>e</sup> contact non{<u>e t</u>}han y<sup>e</sup> acceSs. Therefore at y<sup>e</sup> commencement of every turning movement, y<sup>e</sup> parts moving quicker or slower by continuall impulse inter= nally working to accelerate, & to re= tard, must affect each other, so that all shall fall into equallity or bal= lance as was proposed. suppose y<sup>e</sup> body

<space for diagram?>

AB. to turn in y<sup>e</sup> order AEB.
F. not upon y<sup>e</sup> center or axis C.
w<sup>ch</sup> equally or rather uniformly respects y<sup>e</sup> whole, but upon a center or axis at D. theren y<sup>e</sup> parts at A move swifter than those at B. & those at B slower. Nothing seems more obvious than that y<sup>e</sup> former shall be a means to

accelerate

#### Physica

(95)

accelerate, & y<sup>e</sup> latter to retard, till y<sup>e</sup> forces of all y<sup>e</sup> parts ballance in equal= lity, by transferring y<sup>e</sup> center or axis of y<sup>e</sup> motion to y<sup>e</sup> most indifferent point C. And that perhaps may be determined in y<sup>e</sup> very instant of y<sup>e</sup> contact.

24. The force of a turning body is  $y^e$  summ of  $y^e$  force of all its parts.  $w^{ch}$  will be calculated by  $y^e$  obliquity of impulses that excite it.

For a body equall to y<sup>e</sup> whole impelling at a<sup>65</sup> directly, shall excite a velocity e= quall to that of y<sup>e</sup> impulse, but at y<sup>e</sup> extream obliquity b. a leSs body will ex= cite an equall velocity, that is, of that part turning; & then as y<sup>e</sup> force of y<sup>e</sup> whole body directly impelled is to y<sup>e</sup> same, with y<sup>e</sup> diminution (by y<sup>e</sup> velocity diminishing

The force of bodys turning

 $^{65}$  Geometrical points are referred to in lower-case letters throughout the following section (up to fol. 51r.).

Physica (<del>96</del>) 47

diminishing towards  $y^e$  center) substrac= ted; So is y<sup>e</sup> force of y<sup>e</sup> impellent apply= ed at  $y^e$  diameter a. in all quantitys, to  $y^{\rm e}$  force of  $y^{\rm e}$  same applyed at  $y^{\rm e}$ extream obliquity b. So that suppo= sing  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of a body turning stated by velocity at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  extream parts, to be leSs than that of ye same velo= city as one to two then if any im= pulse at y<sup>e</sup> extream b. by one of Subs= stance will excite there one of velo= city; it will require at  $y^{\rm e}\ diameter$ a, two of substance to excite 1. ve= locity of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole directly. or in some other certain proportion this being certum pro incerto.66

The following diagramm may partly explain this <del>diagram</del> proposition.

Let.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> i.e., 'certainty by incertainty'.

### Physica

(97)

Let  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  circle a, e, d, f, be a solid body c y<sup>e</sup> center, a,c, y<sup>e</sup> semidiameter diS= sected equally in b. & a.g. equall to y<sup>e</sup> periphery aedf, & its half e h, equall to  $y^{\rm e}$  periphery b.i. let  $y^{\rm e}$ whole turn in  $y^{\rm e}$  order a f d, & a small body applyed so as to be im= pelled at a & in a certain time driven to g, that is  $y^{\rm e}$  whole compaSs of  $y^{\rm e}$ revolve at, a And then let  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same body by applyed at e. that on  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  same account shall be driven but to h half  $y^{\rm e}$  length, & so in every other point of y<sup>e</sup> semidiameter propor= tionally: whereby  $y^{\text{e}}$  velocitys from every point of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  semidiameter a c, thus expreSsed will be exposed by lines from  $y^{\rm e}$   $% y^{\rm e}$  respective points determining in  $y^{\text{e}}$  hypothenuse c g, & so  $y^{\text{e}}$  velocitys or force

### Physica

(<del>98</del>) 48

or force of y<sup>e</sup> body moving, from y<sup>e</sup> grea= test a.g. diminish & dye in y<sup>e</sup> center c. But further, lett some body, of magni= tude but just sufficient to stop y<sup>e</sup> turning, be applyed against a. to cease y<sup>e</sup> motion. It will require double y<sup>e</sup> magnitude to stop it, if applyed at b. & so increasing to= wards c. to infinite. And if a will repell y<sup>e</sup> appositious body to g in a certain time, & y<sup>e</sup> like, proceeding towards Cc. y<sup>e</sup> velocity will come to nothing in that center, this will concern mechanicall powers w<sup>ch</sup> I will not anticipate here.

25 Between y<sup>e</sup> extreams of direct & obliq, there is a double effect (viz viz (of y<sup>e</sup> whole) turning & (of y<sup>e</sup> center) a progreSsion.

An impulse upon a diameter is direct

& y<sup>e</sup>.

54. turning & progreSsi= on together (99)

### Physica

&  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  effect single, that is progreSsion, for  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  force is indifferent towards all  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  parts, but declining from that is obliquity, w<sup>ch</sup> makes y<sup>e</sup> impelled separate unequally that is, some parts with more celerity than others, for leSs will yield faster than more, but yet, y<sup>e</sup> whole opposing more or leSs, every part partakes in  $y^e$  separation, &  $y^e$  diffe= rence succeeding of more or leSs swiftneSs of  $y^{\rm e}$  parts  $y^{\rm e}$  body must both turn & pro= ceed; But if  $y^{\text{e}}$  impulse deviate from  $y^{\text{e}}$ direct, & come to  $y^{\rm e}$  extream obliquity,  $y^{\rm e}$ body shall turn, & not proceed, or but very little. As here  $y^e$  body struck at b is di= rect, but at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  impulse is obliq. And in in y<sup>e</sup> separation (respecting y<sup>e</sup> diameter b c) more substa/a\nce lys towards f than to= wards e or (w $^{\rm ch}$  amounts to  $y^{\rm e}$  same) more remote

Physica

(<del>100</del>) 49

remote, therefore e must paSs swifter, but y<sup>e</sup> part a f, must also separate; That is by  $y^{\text{e}}$  center,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  induceth  $y^{\text{e}}$  double effect of turning & progreSsion. But if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  impulse be at  $y^{\text{e}}$  extream obliquity as at e,  $y^{\text{e}}$  whole effect must be (as I said) by turning with= out any progreSsion (ferè).<sup>67</sup> Here y<sup>e</sup> obli= quity depends wholly upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  scituation of  $y^{\rm e}$  parts respecting  $y^{\rm e}$   ${\tt p} {\rm impulse}$  ,  $y^{\rm e}$  momen= of w<sup>ch</sup> (parts) may be imagined, or supposed, but in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  irregularity of things, cannot be accounted for, yet there are experi= ments  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  shew these effects in groSs, as in ye strokes upon a Kitt-catt w<sup>ch</sup> everyone observes. Curvity in y<sup>e</sup> paSsage of y<sup>e</sup> cen= ter upon these oblig impulses cannot be alledged, because  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  reasons afore given for rectilinearity of all free motions will

disprove

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> i.e., 'almost, or nearly'

### (101) Physica

disprove it, for whatever may be said to draw one way, hath its like to draw equally y<sup>e</sup> other way, so being undeter= mined to w<sup>ch</sup>, its must go strait: nor can y<sup>e</sup> old whimsey of various motions not subsisting together in one & y<sup>e</sup> same bo= dy, concern us: for it hath been shewed that as many motions as their may be relations had, will subsist; & indeed every thing that can be conceived of body not inconsistent with impenetrability, tho of infinite variety of motions may be affirmed.

26 With y<sup>e</sup> obliquity y<sup>e</sup> angle of y<sup>e</sup> departure of y<sup>e</sup> progression, from y<sup>e</sup> direct increaseth, & y<sup>e</sup> velocity of it declines.

The progreSsion of  $y^e$  direct is h, [b?]. & of  $y^e$  obliq is h d, &  $y^e$  angle of  $y^e$  departure

is

55 The obliq angle in= creaseth & y<sup>e</sup> pro= greSsion weaker

## Physica (<del>102</del>) 50

is i h d,  $w^{\rm ch}$  by more obliquity, opens thro all degrees of  $y^{\text{e}} \text{ rihght}$  angle i h f as  $y^{\text{e}}$ momenta of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  substance incline towards  $y^{\text{e}}$  extream obliquity, in  $w^{\text{ch}}$  all progreSsi= on is lost; And that y<sup>e</sup> velocity of y<sup>e</sup> pro= greSsion shoud pari paSsu $^{68}$  decline, must so happen, because of y<sup>e</sup> whole effect w<sup>ch</sup> an impulse if direct woud have, that is all progreSsion by hc. what part goes to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  turning, must be detracted from  $y^{\rm e}$  progreSsive, & at  $y^{\rm e}$  extremity e all will be turning as I say'd & no pro= greSsion left, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  effect cannot fall wholly upon either. So that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  turning & angle of departure increase, &  $y^{\rm e}$  ve locity of y<sup>e</sup> progreSs decrease pari paSsu together.

The least.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> i.e. 'in step', or 'step by step'.

56. least ob= liquity diverts

57. Ang: of incidence = y<sup>e</sup> ang: of reflexi= on.

# (103)69

The least 27 The least obliq force in y <sup>e</sup> way of a moving body, in some degree diverts y <sup>e</sup> direc= tion of y <sup>e</sup> movement, making an angle.
<pre>This being little may be called refraction &amp; if much, reflexion as per y<sup>e</sup> next. [6?]     28 if y<sup>e</sup> resistance of such force     or impediment to an obliq mo=     ving body, be infinitely strong,     as y<sup>e</sup> globe of earth is to be     accounted, y<sup>e</sup> angle of reflexi=     on is equall (nearly) to y<sup>e</sup> an=     gle of incidence.</pre>

For judging this angle, we must resume  $\underline{y^e \text{ tangent plane}}$  before described, & is no other than  $y^e$  common planes upon or about  $y^e$  earths surface,  $w^{ch}$  supposed,  $y^e$ 

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 69}$  MN has forgotten to write the header 'Physica', for once.

{\_}}

Physica (<del>104</del>) 51

 $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  event is here described as follows. Let  $y^{\rm e}$  body of A B C.  $^{70}$  be as  $y^{\rm e}$  globe of earth, an infinite resistance H.K,  $y^{\rm e}$  tangent plane, E, a body moving to y<sup>e</sup> contact at D; I say that E shall reflect from D to F so as  $y^{\rm e}$  angle EDK = FDH, & not to L or M. {(}H A{)} being  $y^e$  tangent of  $y^e$  im= pulse, extended to infinite. It must be always understood, that a body approaching another of infinite re= sistance, must sepa= rate from it with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  full velocity of aceSs, for  $y^{\rm e}$  im= pelled not giving any way, y<sup>e</sup> change must appear on  $y^e$  part of  $y^e$  impellent. In ob= liq cases,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  velocity of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  approach is Gaged by y<sup>e</sup>

<space for diagram?>

 $<sup>^{70}</sup>$  MN here returns to using capital letters for geometrical points.

(105)

### Physica

by y<sup>e</sup> tangent plane, as by y<sup>e</sup> normall I K, then a separation by like degrees, must be by y<sup>e</sup> normal GH. If y<sup>e</sup> body DB, gives way, then y<sup>e</sup> reflexion will be by a leSser angle as towards L but if it continues to resist as before, y<sup>e</sup> re= flexion will not ever be towards M. Gaged at y<sup>e</sup> tangent by MH, for so it will depart from it faster than it acceeded, y<sup>e</sup> velocity being y<sup>e</sup> same if DB yeild much y<sup>e</sup> direction may be towards A w<sup>ch</sup> being below y<sup>e</sup> tangent may be called refraction.

Hitherto of impulses either direct, Res= pecting both bodys, or obliq by incli= ning y<sup>e</sup> acceSs, & also by disposition of y<sup>e</sup> substance of y<sup>e</sup> impelled. Now it re= maines to be considered, that obliquity by y<sup>e</sup> disposition of substance may

fall

fall on  $y^{\rm e}$  part of  $y^{\rm e}$  impellent as of  $y^{\rm e}$ impelled,  $y^e$  impulse acting indifferently on both, w<sup>ch</sup> in y<sup>e</sup> varietys of action pro= miscuously in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world, will have like effects, & coming to thse by degrees I lay down this proposition.

29 If y<sup>e</sup> impellent toucheth with obliquity of its substance, there will befall to it, Turning, dimi= nution of force, & diversion of y<sup>e</sup> separating line, Exactly alike as hath been shown of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  impelled.

As  $y^e$  body A meeting an immense ob= stacle at C in an obliq course from D shall turn in y<sup>e</sup> order AFC. & also pro= ceed by its center (perhaps) towards E or as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  substance prevails. And if at  $\boldsymbol{c}$ 

58. Obliquity of y<sup>e</sup> im= pellent,

y<sup>e</sup> body

# (107) Physica

 $y^e$  body cB, is irregular also  $y^e$  like will happen on that side,  $y^e$  track & course of these are hardly to be ac= counted for but in hypothesi, for no= thing is more sure than that  $y^e$  dispo= sition of  $y^e$  substances governe  $y^e$  mode of  $y^e$  separation, & who shall adjust  $y^e$  momenta of them? This shews what various effects promiscuous motion in  $y^e$ world hath.

30. If two bodys impell with obli= quitys in both they may be so ordered that y<sup>e</sup> impeled shall depart in a line near opposite to y<sup>e</sup> line of y<sup>e</sup> acceSs of y<sup>e</sup> im= pellent.

As here Let CD be a body of  $w^{\rm ch}$ 

D is

59. Direction contrary to y<sup>e</sup> impulse

<space for diagram?>
# Physica

D is taken to be  $y^{\rm e}$  center, & let an im= pulse come from A upon B & from that contact (besides turning) Let B. E. thro'  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  center D be  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  progreSsive direction. That will be neer an opposition to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ course of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  acceSs AB. But if E F were an immense obstacle, &  $y^{\rm e}$  side of  $y^{\rm e}$  body C[F?] infinitely slippery, such an impulse at B wou'd drive  $y^e$  whole body almost back towrds E yby DE. ye reason of that shall be given, but in y<sup>e</sup> mean time observe here y<sup>e</sup> foundation of those wonderfull effects of windmill sails & of shipps going against  $y^{\rm e}$  wind, case of obliq impulses,  $w^{\rm ch}$  may be obvi= ously applyed.

If y<sup>e</sup>

{\_}

60. Direction will be in any degree from y<sup>e</sup> force (109) Physica

31. If y<sup>e</sup> substance of y<sup>e</sup> impell/d\ be confined by an immense obstacle, but so as it may move in some degree towwrds y<sup>e</sup> proper sepa= ration, & y<sup>e</sup> force of y<sup>e</sup> impulse is more than superior to y<sup>e</sup> fric= tion, y<sup>e</sup> impelled shall move. will celerity accordingly.

The example is in  $y^e$  former proposition, For  $y^e$  impediment by { $y^e$  confi}nement is not to  $y^e$  whole separation, but to part of it, therefore  $y^e$  Rest shall take place, but very weakly: Upon  $y^e$  reason of this proposition depend diverse surpri= zing incidents in wedge work, as when  $y^e$  wedge driven with a mallet, Instead of working into  $y^e$  cleft, shall

spring

spring out of it in a manner not very safe to y<sup>e</sup> by standers. For when y<sup>e</sup> cleft is too stubborn,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  pinch of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  materiall against  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  slope sides of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  wedge hard driven amount to an impulse, in a manner repercuSsive,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  makes it start out. And so a round thing nippt be= tween{\_\_\_}inger & thumb, is  $mad{e}fly$ a considerable distance. And so a ferry boat is made to steer it self by a rope croSs a river, & no instance is more egregious than  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rudder of a shipp,  $w^{\rm ch}$  having  $y^{\rm e}$  impulse of  $y^{\rm e}$  water violent upon its slope, runns back (as I may say) with  $y^e$  efficacy of all that force so that it draws  $y^{\rm e}$  stern of a mighty shipp with it, & of this sort  $y^{\rm e}$ instances

{\_}}

{\_}}

(111) Physica

instances {of this sort} by windmills & shipp= sailes & others are innumerable.

Force impreSst by an impulse upon any part of an uniform fluid, disperseth an influence quaquaversum ad infinitum.<sup>71</sup>

And this, whether y<sup>e</sup> parts are Regular, irregular or mixt, such as we have pre= sumed most fluids in y<sup>e</sup> world more or leSs to consist of, as air water spiritts oyles &c. for Letting y<sup>e</sup> imagination paSs to & fro from contact to contact thro y<sup>e</sup> center, besides turning; y<sup>e</sup> spreading effect here proposed will appear ne= ceSsary; & as for y<sup>e</sup> infinity, what ever our capacity of sence is, there is no mi= nimum of force more than of Quantity.

In such fluids y<sup>e</sup> tendency of y<sup>e</sup>

force

 $<sup>^{71}</sup>$  i.e., 'in all directions, to infinity'.

Physica (<del>112</del>) 55

force will be by (quasi) strait lines from  $y^e \text{ impulse as a center from all} \\ y^e \text{ parts.}$ 

For accidents working one way will be set right by another, as many accidents are esteemed to produce a certainty; this re= flexion will be of use when we come to consider y<sup>e</sup> case of luminarys, whereof y<sup>e</sup> emanations are strait upon this account & no other.

If y<sup>e</sup> tendency of force in fluido is found to paSs either by pa= ralell or converging lines; a solid immerst of leSs force than y<sup>e</sup> fluid, shall be detru= ded against y<sup>e</sup> course of it, if more, protruded with it, & in equallity be stationary.

This suits  $y^e$  case of gravity & levity [+++]  $w^{ch}$  with

(113) Physica

with y<sup>e</sup> medium imbued with y<sup>e</sup> force is comparative, for nothing can discend or ascend unleSs a quatum of y<sup>e</sup> me= dium either way conformes; & neither can properly be termed the positive.

Gravity hath y<sup>e</sup> property of a perpetual impulse upon y<sup>e</sup> whole substance of y<sup>e</sup> me= dium, with a direction in perpendiculo, & force stated.

This, & y<sup>e</sup> rest that follow, are by com= mon experiment found true, & what= ever disputes may be about y<sup>e</sup> cau= ses of gravity whither interior attrac= tion (as it is canted) or exterior pul= sion, w<sup>ch</sup> is endeavoured in these pa= pers to be demonstrated, y<sup>e</sup> consequen= ces will be alike, & y<sup>e</sup> subject stands referred to its proper place.

A body

A body moving in fluido perse= veres with force as y<sup>e</sup> substance, & y<sup>e</sup> resistance is upon y<sup>e</sup> whole obverted superficies.

Therefore if abobody covered under such part of y<sup>e</sup> superficies, hath its substance unequally disposed, it shall in paSsing turn, & y<sup>e</sup> GroSser part having more per severance, preceed & y<sup>e</sup> rest in course fol= low, & settle in a posture so as y<sup>e</sup> whole substance shall be alike resisted by y<sup>e</sup> matter opposed at y<sup>e</sup> superficies; & that will be when y<sup>e</sup> center of gravity of y<sup>e</sup> body & y<sup>e</sup> center of y<sup>e</sup> obverted su= perficies are in one & y<sup>e</sup> same perpen= dicular line.

As let ABC, be  $y^{\rm e}$  course in  $w^{\rm ch}~y^{\rm e}$  body

А

# (115) Physica

A is propelled; of  $w^{ch} y^e$  center of gravi= ty is a, & y<sup>e</sup> center of y<sup>e</sup> obverted su= ficies b. untill those two points fall in y<sup>e</sup> same perpendicular, that is at B & y<sup>e</sup> points c & d fall in y<sup>e</sup> line Bc, y<sup>e</sup> body will not rest but turn, & settle there.

If a body in  $y^e$  course is resis= ted by an infinite & immoveable force,  $y^e$ the body not, [poised?]<sup>72</sup> at  $y^e$  contact as before, shall turn upon  $y^e$  point of  $y^e$  con= tact as upon a center.

This makes a confinement, so that no other superficiall cen= ter is to be looked for, & in me= chanicks is called y<sup>e</sup> fulchrum, & according as y<sup>e</sup> center of gra= vity falls in or at distance fr<sup>m</sup>.

that

Physica (<del>116</del>) 57

that,  $y^e$  opposite powers of  $y^e$  matter are estimated as to more or leSs prevalent, as here at A & B,. a is  $y^e$  center & b  $y^e$  immoveable obstacle or fulcrum.

How y<sup>e</sup> mechanicall ballance & lever are derived; appears by view of this diagrā, wherein we may suppose y<sup>e</sup> substance wholly deprived, & scheme reduced to a meer line, & y<sup>e</sup> forces oppositions as at A w<sup>ch</sup> is a ballance & B a lever. w<sup>ch</sup> lat= ter is y<sup>e</sup> soul of all mechanicall pow= ers y<sup>e</sup> view of which in draught only explaines y<sup>e</sup> Archimedean aenigma Datum pondus cum data potentia.<sup>73</sup>

The expreSsions here suppose gravity to be y<sup>e</sup> active principle, but all y<sup>e</sup> ef= fects of y<sup>e</sup> lever, & other mechanicall de= vices

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> i.e., 'the greatest conceivable weight with the least conceivable power'. The quotation is likely taken from the book rerferred to on the following page, John Wilkins' *Mathematical Magick, or, The wonders that may by performed by mechanichal geometry: in two books, etc.*, London, 1648, p. 79; the first volume was devoted to an account and explication of Archimedes (*see* note on fol. 114v, below).

# (117) Physica

vices, will fall under y<sup>e</sup> same produc= tion, be y<sup>e</sup> force that of animalls, or any other contingent disposition or ap= plication; & y<sup>e</sup> particularitys of such con= trivances are so well known, & that by their proper names & descriptions, as not to need a speciall declaration or delineation here, but (no dispraise to y<sup>e</sup> later authors) none hath perfor= med better than D<sup>r</sup> Wilkins.

61. Mecha= nicall powers. 32 In all mechanicall dispos= tions of matter, wherein bodys in action are opposed, y<sup>e</sup> ad= vantages result from y<sup>e</sup> seve= rall velocitys compared, uni= versally.

This refers to engine-work, & is a co=/rollary  $\hfill drawn$ 

Physica (118) 58

drawn from  $y^{\rm e}$  common theory of force,=  $w^{\rm ch} \ y^{\rm e} is$  compound of quantity, & time, that is velocity of matter. And may be in= creased by multiplication of either ad in= finitum. But  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  proposition above is taken in here as a test of all mecha= nicall powers. & dispositions whatsoe= ver; for be ye contrivance what it will, whither,  $y^{\rm e}$  common as  $y^{\rm e}$  lever, pulley, screw, or otherwise more out of  $y^{\text{e}}$  way, take an account of  $y^{\text{e}}$  space in  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}\ y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  weight (to  $y^{\mbox{\tiny use}}$  that for instance) moves, & that in which  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  force moves in y<sup>e</sup> same time (allowing for fric= tion) & those two spaces compared,  $\underline{\texttt{gi}}/\texttt{gi} \backslash \texttt{ves} \ \texttt{y}^{\texttt{e}}$  proportion of  $\texttt{y}^{\texttt{e}}$  one power  $\texttt{ag}^{\texttt{st}}$ ye other obtained by ye engine. As to

instance

[(219)?]

instance, by a screw  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  weight shall rise one foot,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  hand that turnes it, shall paSs y<sup>e</sup> space of ten feet, w<sup>ch</sup> gives y<sup>e</sup> me= chanicall advantage of ten to one. And so of pulleys, measure  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  space shortened by  $y^{\rm e}$  weight rising, &  $y^{\rm e}$  length of rope that paSseth.  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  hand in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same time, & those compared give ye proper= tion; so of a wedge, as the length of y<sup>e</sup> wedge, to y<sup>e</sup> cleft opened by y<sup>e</sup> paS= sing of it, so  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  proportion; therefore a sharp wedge hath most force; by those & other devices machines are com= pounded to exceed ye power of materiall, to resist, whereof  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  art lyes chiefly in y<sup>e</sup> application of them. Cartesius wou'd not allow time in y<sup>e</sup> cause of

mechanicall

mechanicall powers tho it allways fell out so, for congruences are not causes. But he mistakes  $y^e$  case, for  $y^e$  ques= tion is not of causes but y<sup>e</sup> demensions, that is of velocity as well as quan= tity.

61.2. 33. A body detained in a circular motion, & set free, shall depart as by impulse at y<sup>e</sup> last con= tact, whither it be a tangent to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  gyration, or not; as was hinted before.

This is by  $way^{74}$  of demonstration ag<sup>st</sup> those who lodge motus verus<sup>75</sup> of body in a compaSs movement, for, say thay, it always tends to depart in a tangent,  $w^{\rm ch}$  pro= duceth a reseSs of all matter

so

<sup>74</sup> There is a circular mark, in ink, above the 'a' in 'way'.

Body moved in circulo, not tend but

<space for diagram?>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> i.e., 'true movement', not a new term, but here used to invoke Newton who referred to '*motus verus* et absolutus' (ie., 'true and absolute movement'), that is the movement of an object not determined in relation to other objects, but as an absolute movement in absolute space (both of which concepts were anathema to Cartesians such as RN).

(121) Physica

so moved from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  centr, so farr, is true, that matter set free, shall so depart, because it will be by straight lines,  $w^{\rm ch}$  in course must at length leave  $y^{\rm e}$ cpmpass & its center. But that it will be in a tangent I deny, unless  $y^e$  rules of impulses require it, & every depar= ture shall be according to those rules. It was insisted that in y<sup>e</sup> compaSs mo= tions,  $y^e$  last touch  $\{\underline{\Theta r}\}$ , or instant of freedom is an impulse. Then let  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ table [c?] turn round horizontally in y<sup>e</sup> order ABD, & let three bodys be deteined as in  $y^{\text{e}}$  figure; & then apply a desperate stop at F. &  $y^{\rm e}$ bodys shall fly away as by lines from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  contact through their centers.  $w^{ch}$  here is described, whereof only A shall paSs in a tangent, but B outwa/rds\ & D

{\_}}

& D. inwards. So let sand be strowed upon ye table as at C, when ye stopp comes, those shall not go off in tangents, but shall flirt about every way, as  $y^e$  impulses [shoul?]occasion to di= rect them. Here is neither conatus nor tendency<sup>76</sup> more than in other bo= dys under a continuall impulse, & for setting up a motus verus distin= guisht from all other motions, some other device must be sought, for this will not do. It may happen that ge= nerally these departures may appear in tangents, but it is because  $y^{\rm e}$ manner of detension, &  $y^{\rm e}$  impulses, by y<sup>e</sup> universall rules require it. I state this instance as at a stopp at

F.

 $<sup>^{76}</sup>$  'Conatus' is a Aristotelian term. The Latin word 'conatus' ('trying' or 'endeavouring') was a translation of the Greek word  $\dot{o}\rho\mu\dot{\eta}$ . Conatus, or  $\dot{o}\rho\mu\dot{\eta}$ , suggests a desire or will on the part of an object to behave in a certain way, it suggests an anthropomorphism. The word is ubiquitous in early-modern physics, as well as other sciences. Descartes adopted the term and sought to employ it in a purely materialistic sense, meaning the tendency of an object to move when struck by another object. RN did not approve of Descartes' use of the word and he criticised it in a number of places in the MSS (as does MN below, at f. 61v, where he declares that he uses the term for 'conformity of speech'), however he nevertheless continued to use it – although as we see here, he might seek to qualify it with a 'mechanistic' English translation, 'tendency'.

(123) Physica

F, but it had been all one, it had been stated so as y<sup>e</sup> table & y<sup>e</sup> bodys contiguous, in those postures, [head?] all rested together, &, instead of a stopp, an impulse had fell at F y<sup>e</sup> depar= ure had been y<sup>e</sup> very same, for a stopp & an impulse are in truth in all respects alike, so that no more reality can be argued of y<sup>e</sup> turning, than might be inferred from y<sup>e</sup> common impulsive force, & y<sup>e</sup> motus verus appears no more in y<sup>e</sup> one case than in y<sup>e</sup> other, both being alike relative.

631.<sup>3.</sup> nNo cona= tus ad mo tum 34. No tendency or conatus ad motum in any case whatever.

It is easy to shew what is true in those cases in  $w^{\rm ch}$  conatus or tendency are re/puted  $$\totake$$ 

Physica. (<del>12</del>4) 61

to take place, but it is not easy to di= vell ye prejudice of such notions, out of mens minds, being grounded upon a vulgar Idea of reallity in motion, & some phenomena intirely mistaken; as when they say, omne Grave tendit deorsum,  $^{77}$  & y<sup>e</sup> like. The truth of all those cases is no more but this; There is a continuance or rather continu= all repetition of impulses upon a bo= dy,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  cannot evidently answer them by moving, by reason of some impe= diment, but still  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  imulses continue,  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\&}}$  when  $y^{\rm e}$  impediment is removed, then  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  body evidently moves persuant to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  last of those impulses, & it is said that in y<sup>e</sup> mean time it rested under a cona=/tus\ ad motum

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 77}$  i.e., 'everything heavy tends to decend'

# (125) Physica

ad motum. Therefore whenever, for confor= mity of speech, one is tempted to use  $y^e$  word tendency or conatus, it must suppose a motive cause, but effectleSs by reason of impediments, or at least whatever  $y^e$  effect is, it doth not ap= pear to us. And I cannot but wonder that our capitall philosophers,<sup>78</sup> have made conatus almost a principle, or at least are not explained as to  $y^e$ truth of it.

61.<sup>3.</sup> No comp<del>ound</del>/ound\ or mixt motions.

35. Motion is always single & never mixt nor compounded.

If a notion is derived from divers pul= ses succeSsive, & is so reputed of a nature commixt, all y<sup>e</sup> motions in y<sup>e</sup> wordld are mixt & none single, Such are y<sup>e</sup> infinite various

 $<sup>^{78}</sup>$  A list of these would obviously include Descartes, and also include Hobbes, Spinoza and Leibnitz, all of whom elaborated fruitfully, although diversely, from the concept of conatus.

# Physica (<del>126</del>) 62

various agitations of y<sup>e</sup> mundane fluids. Therefore y<sup>e</sup> question is not of such, but of impulse separately considered, such (& in truth there are no other) cannot be compounded because in y<sup>e</sup> effect they are instantaneous. If a body be struck by two or more points in y<sup>e</sup> same instant, y<sup>e</sup> case is y<sup>e</sup> same as of an impulse upon y<sup>e</sup> medium or center of all, as was ob= served before. The ordinary insta/a\nce gi= ven is by y<sup>e</sup> production of a diagonal.

As let a body move upon y<sup>e</sup> side of a **quadrates**quare from A to B, & in y<sup>e</sup> same time let it be born down from A to C & y<sup>e</sup> path of its motion will be y<sup>e</sup> diagonall AD. Nor this is not two motions, but [...?] **y<sup>e</sup> same** two relations applyed to one &

<space for diagram?>

(127) Physica

one &  $y^{\text{e}}$  same /prescribed\ motions. For suppose  $y^{\text{e}}$  body not moved out of  $y^e$  line AB, but  $y^e$  qua= drate or frame AD, by itelf, (being loose from AB) mounted (in y<sup>e</sup> time) up to GH, without touch or concern with  $y^{\rm e}$  body of A,  $w^{\rm ch}$  from a simple im= pulse persues its course (in time) to B. Is not y<sup>e</sup> diagonal AH as well pictured as by y<sup>e</sup> suppositious mixture of motion in A? so here are two relations, one to  $y^{\text{e}}$  station direct, from A to B,  $y^{\text{e}}$  other imaginary of a quadrate from A to G. these two relations have nothing to do each other, but a consequence is derived of both. Therefore this is a Mathema= ticall & not a physicall case; those ar= tists supposing such motive paths, gene= rate (as they style it) many various forms, of  $\mathtt{w}^{\mathtt{ch}}$ 

<red BM stamp>

of  $w^{\rm ch}$  nothing is true, but imaginary re= lations,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  are arbitrary, that is, to be or not to be any thing or nothing, as was at first observed. If in a shipp un= der sail, an arrow is sent right up, & then collate y<sup>e</sup> shipps way, y<sup>e</sup> sun, starrs, y<sup>e</sup> soil,  $wy^e$  water, with y<sup>e</sup> line y<sup>e</sup> arrow makes, what a perplexure is y<sup>e</sup> path of that arrow, & how many relations must conspire in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  describing it? But this proceSs of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  mathematicians is not here accused, as for any absurdity in supposing lines created in this manner, because all things poSsible,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  include no contradiction, may be supposed, where= by to gain a proof of certain measures, & propositions. But when they come to physicall matters, & pretend to demonstrate reall

# (129) Physica

reall truths, from no better data than such suppositions, we abrenounce them. Des Cartes in his Dioptrica, pretended to demonstrate y<sup>e</sup> equiangularity of reflexi= on, by supposing a mixt motion; And a latter author<sup>79</sup> borrows that conceipt, & carrys it a great way further & pre= tends to demonstrate thereby all ye known mechanicall powers; And to both it is answer enough that there is no mixt motion, & that they can never prove any, so down-falls  $y^{\rm e}$  demonstration, If naturall aSsertions are to be proved, it must be done by reall & experimented truths, & founded upon universall axi= oms; not by subtile [contrivancis?] & ar= tifices of imagination. And therein lyes  $y^e$  infirmity of all our physico-mathemati/call  $\$ undertakers

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> i.e., Isaac Newton.

# Physica (<del>130</del>) 64

undertakers in naturall philosophy, as I have elsewehere observed, & with some far= ther explanation of my thoughts upon that subject. And here, I may repeat that whenever we shall leave y<sup>e</sup> tracts of reall truths in naturall philosophy, & take in with y<sup>e</sup> mathematicians, we exchange knowledge for suppositions. Now for reconciling action in fluido take these two propositions & what follows.

61<sup>4</sup> Motive influences infinite 36 A body continguous to another, is impelled, that shall impell y<sup>e</sup> other according to rule & that others as far as contigu= ity happ<del>en</del>/en\s in y<sup>e</sup> directions

I might expreSs this proposition with much variety

(1	.31)	Physica

<space for diagram?>

varivariety of forms & those irregu= lar, but this here of a few regulars shew y<sup>e</sup> course as well. For imagination armed with y<sup>e</sup> rules of impulses will repre= sent any instance that can be proposed. Here y<sup>e</sup> globe A im= pelled at E impells B. & that C & so D, all in y<sup>e</sup> same instant. And y<sup>e</sup> di= rections falling as here at a, b, c, d, y<sup>e</sup> last will fall directly pointed con=

trary to y<sup>e</sup> first. Hence may be con= ceived y<sup>e</sup> infinte tendencys among ir= regulars, especially fluids, & that an uniformity of action results (as I ob= served of rectilinearity) to us sensible w<sup>ch</sup> in y<sup>e</sup> elements is imperceivable, &

therefore

65r

Physica (<del>132</del>) 65

	therefore turns into hypotheses; /And\ thereby
	hility of that influences may be so won=
	dorfully convoyed as we observe of
	them for extending guaguage and over
	chem, a excending quaquaversum even
	as infinitum, w <sup>ch</sup> considering that mo=
	tion consists in relation only is not very
	paradoxical.
61.5.	37. Bodys devided resist leSs than
Resistance	y <sup>e</sup> same united
	As $y^e$ bodys B & C. impelled $y^e$ A with
	diverse directions, Resist leSs than E &
	F impelled by D al in one direction
	This is considerable with respect to y <sup>e</sup>
	transit of bodys in fluido as per next.
61.6	<b>1 1</b>
Fluids re=	38 Bodys conglomerate in solido,
sist less	are leSs resisted by fluids, of
than pow=	w <sup>ch</sup> y <sup>e</sup> parts are in perpetuall
ders	motion

(133) Physica

motion, than if resting tho' loose as powders.

For y<sup>e</sup> parts moving are a force per= petually in ballance; so that to de= termine their courses, one way or o= ther, requires little motive force, & that last sufficient to turn y<sup>e</sup> scales. It hath been pretended that equall substance resists, & therefore without vacuity, there can be no motion at all. Now as to fluids, y<sup>e</sup> case is y<sup>e</sup> same as of scales, put  $100^{\pm 180}$  weight in each, w<sup>ch</sup> shall rest in ballance, add to one a sin= gle ounce & y<sup>e</sup> whole  $200^{\pm 1}$  shall move, this is not by y<sup>e</sup> force of y<sup>e</sup> ounce, for what is that ag<sup>st</sup>  $200^{\pm 2}$  but it is effec= tuall by means of y<sup>e</sup> equilibrity deter= mined; so a fluid is in a state of per= petuall but uniforme preSsure of all

y<sup>e</sup> parts

Physica (134) 66

y<sup>e</sup> parts equilibrated against each other, & y<sup>e</sup> least force serves to determine y<sup>e</sup> action wherever there is a capacity for it to move. Therefore a solid im= pelled, is not resisted with equall quantity, as if it were collected into one maSs in opposition. But acts by opening & closing as scales by rising & falling & ye fluid parts by their proper motion conforming. If a body shou'd detrude  $y^{\rm e}$  matter before, & leave a void behind,  $y^{\rm e}$  opposition wou'd be totall, but  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  void behind receives in course  $y^e$  matter from before fal= ling in as when one weight sinks  $y^{\rm e}$ other riseth; This disperseth ye mist raised against plenitude by a preten= ded inconsistency of motion in fluido. Α

61<sup>7</sup> Bodys in fluido move<del>s</del> we<del>g</del>dge= wise (135) Physica

39. A solid in fluido moves wedge wise, either by y<sup>e</sup> form of it, or by y<sup>e</sup> fluid collected both be= fore & behind, & born along with y<sup>e</sup> solid.

If y<sup>e</sup> superficies in front be a flat, y<sup>e</sup>
water about y<sup>e</sup> middle of y<sup>e</sup> front
cannot be at y<sup>e</sup> edge in a moment
therefore that (& so likewise more & more,
till near y<sup>e</sup> edge it may paSs sliding by)
is carryed with y<sup>e</sup> body in its motion;
& y<sup>e</sup> like if y<sup>e</sup> superficies behind be a
flatt, for always some of y<sup>e</sup> fluid will
remain there by way of edge or shel=
ter. As here y<sup>e</sup> body a moving in flu=
ido towards /b.\ be, carrys a part of y<sup>e</sup> fluid
b fibefore it, of a figure nearly pyra=/midall

& so

Physica (<del>136</del>) 67

& so in like manner  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  eddy behind it as at c. And it must be remembred that a swift motion carrys more of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ medium & in sharper pyramid than a slower, because leSs time is allowed to shift out of  $y^{\rm e}$  way, & for that reason a very violent course (as of a cannon bullet) seems to rend y<sup>e</sup> air [& &?] make a noise accordingly, for ye driven air by alternate compreSsions & relaxations breaks away at times, & as may happen like disorder behind. but a slow motion allows  $y^e$  fluid ac= tion time according to  $y^{\rm e}$  density to ac= commodate, & then  $y^{\rm e}$  paSsage is tran= quill. And this will also depend much upon y<sup>e</sup> constitution of y<sup>e</sup> medium, for if it

67r

# (137) Physica

if it be very dense & not without te= nacity, as melted pitch, some oyles, or mercury, y<sup>e</sup> impediments will be grea= ter & these gatherings more; so that y<sup>e</sup> different circumstances of moving bo= dys, w<sup>ch</sup> are very many, are always to be considered. And however such a= gencys, of /w<sup>ch</sup>\ y<sup>e</sup> elements being impercep= tible, are in our Ideas of them con= fused, yet we must consider that they acto by solid parts, w<sup>ch</sup> are bodys govern'd by mechanick rules, no leSs than a con= geries of millstones so actuate woud be, but of fluids more afterwards.

40 The quantity of y<sup>e</sup> fluid born a= long with a body moving, is to be accounted as so much of sub/stance\ added

61:<sup>8</sup> Substance added from y<sup>e</sup> fluid. added to it.

All  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  vertuosi are disposed to put their cases of motion in vacuo, & I have com= plyed with it, to fend off a shower of objectins Ready to fall if I stated y<sup>e</sup> matter otherwise, for most of them make  $y^{\rm e}$  rules in one state &  $y^{\rm e}$  other, toto caelo different;<sup>82</sup> as I might instance in many, one is of Pardie's, who holds that in vacuo, ye least body moved ye greatest with e= quall velocity, & why? because a body was indifferent to move or to rest, & any thing that determined  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  indifference prevailes, but he considered not that there was more & leSs in  $y^{\rm e}$  cause, &  $y^{\rm e}$ indifference went only to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  thing but not to y<sup>e</sup> cause /degrees\. But I must maintain that all

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>81</sup> MN's own page numbering (crossed out in pencil by the BM curators) goes a little haywire over the following pages. This number appears to be 188 corrected to 138.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 82}$  i.e., 'the whole of the heavens' different, i.e., completely different.

(1<del>8</del>59) Physica

that all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rules supposed to take place in vacuo, are of like force in pleno, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  adhering medium is but so much added to  $y^{\rm e}$  quantity of  $y^{\rm e}$  body im= pelled,  $\frac{1}{4}$  /  $\frac{1}{4}$  it is not materiall how it may vary in  $y^{\rm e}$  course of proceeding, for  $y^{\rm e}$  impulse is a meer moment, in  $w^{\rm ch}$  it is determined what  $y^{\rm e}$  quantity is, &  $y^{\rm e}$  inception of  $y^{\rm e}$  separation is ac= cordingly & so also is  $y^{\rm e}$  resistance when a body in fluido is impelled by another. The propositions of single impulses, on  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}\ y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  whole hypothesis of force depends, may seem too abstract or speculative to demaund an aSsent with such authority as if mathema= tically & in form demonstrated  ${\tt \pm For}$ 

altho'.

69r

61.9 Cases of motion not to be demon= strated mathe= matical= ly. Physica

(<del>1940</del>) 69

altho quantities of substance, velocitys & positions may be postulated, with as much certainty as figures & dimensi= ons are in mathematicks, yet  $y^{\rm e}$  con= clusions are not alike. For  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  latter determine of certain & permanent quantitys (consequentially) but these here conclude in event, & it is impoSsi= ble speculatively to exclude  $y^e$  im= perious (may be). It is probable a mathema= tician adept; may adjust these propositions with more art & exactneSs, than here is doen, & obviate y<sup>e</sup> jealousy w<sup>ch</sup> many may, & I must, have of errors & mistakes. But after all  $y^{\rm e}$  aforesaid (may be) will in= terpose, & any one may say to any of them

(1<del>9</del>/4\1)

Physica

them, perhaps it may fall out otherwise. Therefore there is no strikt relyance upon consequences, by any indication, but that of experiment; And what applications in that way, & with what assurance such may be made is to be considered next.

First no experiment of these cases can be made precise or without y<sup>e</sup> adjunct of a (nearly) or (a little more or leSs) because substances cannot actually be adjusted (as mathematicks aSsume) in any reall proportions exactly. Nor can y<sup>e</sup> same be done as to figures & shapes, & least of all velocitys, w<sup>ch</sup> must be sta= ted at y<sup>e</sup> instant of y<sup>e</sup> contact, w<sup>ch</sup> cannot be done

61.10 How to experi= ment im= pulses.

# Physica

(<del>1942</del>) 70

be done with tollerable satisfaction; for ye mediall resistances perpetually influ ence to diminish them. But in  $y^{\text{e}}\xspace$  GroSs, & at  $y^{\rm e}$  chief periods of  $y^{\rm e}$  computations, Experiments may declare  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  events of impulses so nearly as may amount to y<sup>e</sup> higest degree of probability. In order to w<sup>ch</sup> I propose to take in hand solid lumps of mettall, such as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  heads of iron hammers, w<sup>ch</sup> have y<sup>e</sup> least spring and are most obdurate. Choose of these  $y^{\text{e}}$  fittest for  $y^{\text{e}}$  purpose, & have a near gueSs at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  weight, whereby to aSsign  $y^{\rm e}$  measures of  $y^{\rm e}$  substances to be impellent or impelled in proportion. Lett these swing at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  arms end, hanging per= pendicularly, & moving freely, & so lett them clash face /to\ to face & observe as one may

70r

(1943) Physica

one may quasi feel.

First an equall shall drive its equall with  $y^{\text{e}}$  same speed, & nearly stop in its place, & if they meet equally swift, they shall part several ways in like man= ner, And if unequally swift  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parting will be with commuted velocity. This of equalls upon equalls is almost a standard case. The next is that a leSs body against a greater shall reflect nearly as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  difference. And a greater upon a leSs, shall follow. And upon an oblong with obliquity of substance shall make it turn as well as de= part, &  $y^{\rm e}$  leSs obliq leSs turning, & with more, more. So also of y<sup>e</sup> progreSsion,  $y^{\rm e}$  more obliq  $y^{\rm e}$  slower. And of irre= gulars somewhat may be observed by

theise
Physica (<del>1944</del>) 71

this means & a great deal from  $y^{\rm e}$  ordi= nary & contingent clashings of bodys, that happen among operators. One might invent, & dispose matters for ex= periment of these cases more [cleaverly?], as by Granado shells filled more or leSs with leaden shott, or having ye weights adjusted by melted lead powered in, & suspended at long radius's. These suffered to clash, being weighty, will move slow & shew  $y^{\rm e}$  events, so as they may be near= ly judged by  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  bare eye. But somewhat must be allowed to  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  spring of such bodys, tho even that may be corrected by filling  $y^{\text{e}}$  shells with water (if le/e\ad be not used)  $w^{ch}$  hath no spring. If  $y^e$ discovery of these events make aappear that a measure of substance & velocity decide these groSs consequences, it will be thought (1<del>9</del>45) Physica

thought probable that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  like govern ex= quisitely in all cases of impulses whatever, & if  $y^{\rm e}$  momenta of each might be pre= cisely known or stated, y<sup>e</sup> conclusions wou'd be nearly mathematical; And  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ same hath been attemptd in some mea= sure, but not with an universall view, that I know of. I have been more  $co\{n=\}$ {th}at this subject of mechanicall force shou'd be carefully apprehended, because some physicall conclusions depend upon it. For whatever of motion is true in cases of groSs bodys, is true of all like forms & proportions tho never so small. And neither immensity nor exility of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ proportion of events, & where we cannot prove by actuall experiment, we must grant upon  $y^{\rm e}$  analogy of causes & effects. Eadem

{\_ cernd}

72r

	Physica ( <del>196</del> ) 72
Of impul= ses trac=	Eadem ratio eadem lex. <sup>83</sup>
tive	It may be recollected that before prop: 28 for better judging inclinatory cases, or obliq impulses, I have spread y <sup>e</sup> point of contact into an universal (imaginary) plane, naming it y <sup>e</sup> tangent, of w <sup>ch</sup> some further use is to be made. In y <sup>e</sup> mean time I wou'd not have it thought a meer chimaera, for a point is indivisible, & cannot be touched or touch by any di= rections expanded or inclined beyond y <sup>e</sup> compass of an hemisphear according to Euclid who allows no quantity to y <sup>e</sup> an= gle of contact therefore every point
{_}}	acceSsible is quasi y <sup>e</sup> tangent point of a circle, & that becoming an indefinite plane determines t{ <u>o h</u> }emisphears of w <sup>ch</sup> y <sup>e</sup> supe=/rior\ may be

 $^{\rm 83}$  i.e., 'the same reason the same law' (more properly 'ubi eadem ratio, ibi eadem lex').

(197) Physica.

may be called  $y^e$  hemisphear of  $y^e$  force, &  $y^e$  inferior  $y^e$  hemisphear of  $y^e$  departure, for as  $y^e$  impulse cannot come from any point without  $y^e$  sweep of  $y^e$  former, so  $y^e$  departure of  $y^e$  impelled cannot be to= wards any point without  $y^e$  latter, all  $w^{ch}$   $y^e$  view of  $y^e$  diagram to pro 28 will demonstrate.

This extends to all cases universally, where y<sup>e</sup> tangent plane does not in= tersect y<sup>e</sup> body impelled or any part of it. But it may happen that some, if not y<sup>e</sup> greatest part of it may (by such intersection) fall within y<sup>e</sup> hemisphear of y<sup>e</sup> force, & perhaps y<sup>e</sup> departure of such part if not of y<sup>e</sup> center of y<sup>e</sup> impelled may tend into y<sup>e</sup> same hemisphear.

Therefore

Physica (<del>198</del>) 73

Therefore I must make a distinction between forces pulsive & tractive so that ye depar= ture of so much of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  impelled as falls beneath  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  tangent plane is from a force pulsive, & as to so much as falls above  $y^{\rm e}$ tangent is from a force tractive; w<sup>ch</sup> I observe because I may not seem to have done half my work. But  $\{\underline{y^e \ doc}\}$ trine will by plain analogy govern both cases alike,  $\ensuremath{\texttt{\&}}$  there cannot be an impulse contrived so interior as to leave great part of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  impelled in y<sup>e</sup> hemisphear of y<sup>e</sup> force, but with= all a point may be found in  $y^{\rm e}$  exterior superficies on  $w^{\rm ch}$  a force falling im= pulsively will not cause y<sup>e</sup> very same departure, of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  be this a diagram

{\_}}

<space for diagram?>

	(199) Physica.	
{_}	$\{()\}$ Contact point. be center of y <sup>e</sup> impelled.	
{_}	pulsive, bd common departure. f g, tangent plane. And thus every force whether pulsive or tractive falls un= der y <sup>e</sup> like rules of impulses w <sup>ch</sup> are for= med upon y <sup>e</sup> velocity of y <sup>e</sup> action & quan= tity of substance universally as hath been before particularly declared, & are y <sup>e</sup> law of all mechanicks.	
	Extent of our Facult <del>ie</del> ys	
62.		
Difference	Thus farr in generall, concerning y <sup>e</sup> princi=	
between	ples from whence all our knowledge of	
perception	nature is derived; And in y <sup>e</sup> next place	
& know=	wee advance, by some applications to y <sup>e</sup>	
ledge	state of y <sup>e</sup> universe as it is represented	
	to our minds by means of sensation;	
	And under this we must distinguish	

between perception & knowledge; for we

often

Physica

often have strong perceptions, but we know not of what, but only that we perceive, as when men say they are uneasy, or that they ail somewhat, but know no more. This is a true but not a usefull sensation,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  (latter) comes only by knowledge. And when we have not power to perceive  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ constituent parts of any object, we may admire, but without some as= cititious instruction, we remain igno= rant in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  midst of sensation. And out of this ignorance flows certain adventitious but false Ideas of some= what,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  in truth are as nothing, as (for example) continuation, for all things in  $y^{\rm e}$  world small & great, are alike distinct one from y<sup>e</sup> other, how= ever we may perceive aggregates, as

being

7	4	v
---	---	---

	(201) Physica
	being singulars, w <sup>ch</sup> is a false perception; as of y <sup>e</sup> Galaxy, Harmony, Heat, & even time itself, w <sup>ch</sup> are all by distinct touches yet to our minds represent a continu= ation. As for space or corporeal ex= tension it is, y <sup>e</sup> only thing in y <sup>e</sup> world w <sup>ch</sup> may be understood continuando. <sup>84</sup> But yet it comes to our notice only by pul= ses distinct for all materiall things in y <sup>e</sup> world w <sup>ch</sup> transact them are dis=
63	tributed per partes. <sup>85</sup>
The ex=	
tent of	It becomes therefore very materiall to
our fa=	be well informed whence this defect, $\&$
culties.	y <sup>e</sup> consequent errors proceed; & it seems
	y <sup>e</sup> cause lys not in any default in our
	perception, for that is perfect, but
	in y <sup>e</sup> power of our members to act
{_}	$\{\underline{w^{ch}}\}$ according/g\ to their frame & magnitude
	is limited & respects other substances,
	comparatively

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>84</sup> i.e., 'to be continuous'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>85</sup> i.e., 'from each individually', the point being that we apprehend the continuity of the world around us from a host of individual instances of (or in) that world.

### Physica

(<del>202</del>) 75

comparatively,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  is mechanick. For if we cannot mark  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  diversity of things by some action of our mem= bers, as nodding, pointing, or  $y^{\rm e}$  like, such things appear, not diverse, but continued; as in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  instances above. And it is obvious to conceive that diverse pusille animalls, as flys &c w<sup>ch</sup> move their wings with notable celerity, may perceive very minute things distinctly as  $y^{\text{e}}$  ingredients of colours &c  $w^{\text{ch}}$  to us seem continued; & if we retire to y<sup>e</sup> seat of imagination & see what is doing there; we shall find that nothing in that sphear will have place, but what[,?] is or may be corpor/e\ally transacted Any one may prove this by his power of interior reflection. For let him on= ly imagine numbers of any thing paSsing by

(203) Physica

by, & in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  Idea of counting he must conceive himself acting, & if  $y^{\rm e}$  fancy carry them so fast, as in truth  $y^{\rm e}$  ac= tion could not have distinguished, y<sup>e</sup> Imagination wou'd not do it but fall into a conceipt of continuance, as in fact y<sup>e</sup> sence it self in like case had done. And this extends to spaces, for altho we may move a finger an inch, we cannot do it an hair's breadth; therefore small dimensions are inconceivable, &  $y^{\rm e}$  mind in  $y^{\rm e}$ act of attention to various things is limited; for there can be no atten= tion to such as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  members can by no means distinguish; & therefore free will  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  commands  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  attention fails of its power, for if one hath an utmost desire to distinguish & applys

to it

{\_}

64. Difference between distingiuish= ables & indistin= guishables Physica

(<del>204</del>) 76

to it with all y<sup>e</sup> powers of {<u>its</u>} will, unless he hath his instruments where-with to act corporally or at least fancy so he cannot attain his desire, therefore it is concluded that indistinction argues no imperfection in y<sup>e</sup> mind, or apprehension of things, but that all defect proceeds from y<sup>e</sup> magnitude or power of y<sup>e</sup> bodily engine; And that must be intended when we say, any thing is in or out of y<sup>e</sup> reach of our faculties.

Hence flows a distinction very mate= riall in all naturall science, & that is between things distinguishable & indistinguishable; this distinction is not founded in y<sup>e</sup> nature of things, but in y<sup>e</sup> power of our facultys. For, as I sayd all

### (205) Physica

all corporeall powers great & small are ruled by like measures, & those are  $y^{\rm e}$  e= vents of impulses; as hath been at large dilated in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  aforegoing propositions. And in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  promiscuous state of things moving in  $y^{\rm e}$  world,  $y^{\rm e}$  actions & events of bodys that are distinguishable, are y<sup>e</sup> proper objects of sence, & being experimentable by diverse /modes of applications afford us just appearances,  $\ensuremath{\&}$  we need not fall under any mistakes concerning them; And within these limits are compriszed all things that our sences can take any precise account of circumscribe, or terminate, with  $y^{\rm e}\ proper$ powers & symptomes of their natures,  $w^{\rm ch}$ ordinary practise, or more diligent expe rience have more or leSs discovered to us; &

us & I need not add instances of things so well known;  $y^e$  single one of a golden ball, toucht upon before interprets all the rest.<sup>86</sup>

And I may summ up all by referring to na= turall history, of w<sup>ch</sup> every man that lives, & breaths, gathers his share, & some, with most laudable industry have collected much more; w<sup>ch</sup> (in history) have been & are dai/aily communicated for y<sup>e</sup> benefit of human kind. And y<sup>e</sup> great patrons of discoverys, by art & mechanick con= trivances, have brought to light & ma= nifest distinction, such exillitys as nude perception by many parasangs cou'd ne= ver have reached; such as y<sup>e</sup> animaculae, & circulation (as it is called) of y<sup>e</sup> blood most evidently seen in fishes,<sup>87</sup> & on y<sup>e</sup> other side, of

65. Naturall history im= proved.

77r

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> See f. 7, above.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup> MN/RN here refers, of course, to the microscope and the telescope. The demonstration of the circulation of the blood by means of viewing the tail-fin of a fish through a microscope (against a bright light) is famously associated with Anthony van Leeuwenhoek (1632-1723).

### (207) Physica

side, of amazing immensitys whereby y<sup>e</sup> cosmography of y<sup>e</sup> universe is in great measure regulated, all w<sup>ch</sup> with y<sup>e</sup> leSser operations of y<sup>e</sup> virtuosi accumulate experiences, but yet do not develope y<sup>e</sup> crypticks of nature, that reside in mi= nuteneSses indistinguishable & so utterly inscrutable. And what is to be y<sup>e</sup> phi= losophick behaviour as to those mat= ters, must come under consideration, next.

As to  $y^e$  condition of  $y^e$  universe, while we have no sence or experiment of va= cuity, there is no reason to presume ag=/st\ absolute plenitude of impenetrables, according as was insisted before. And that in all fluids there is a manifest de{<u>fvi</u>}sion of  $y^e$  matter into minute parts or bodys

66.
Indistin=
guishables
[exteemed?]
by analo=
gy with dis=
tinguishables

{\_}}

### Physica (<del>208</del>) 78

or bodys,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  are in perpetuall motion & counter change of places, is discovered, by  $y^{\rm e}$  dispersion of powders, smoak & o= dours,  $w^{\rm ch}$  are most sensible, & cou'd not o= therwise happen. And  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  like is made apparent by y<sup>e</sup> paSsage of groSs sub= stances, with little or no disorder, thro' them. And seeing that about us we find all distinguishable substances, unequall, variously figured, & without any kind of regularity, we have rea= son a similitudine to conjecture, that  $y^{\text{e}}$  rest of  $y^{\text{e}}$  divided matter of  $y^{\text{e}}$  world (in those respects) must be in a like condition, that is difforme & irregularr. And we find also that not only yethe common lumps of matter both great & small, as stones, sand &  $y^{\rm e}$  like (of  $w^{\rm ch}$ we

(209) Physica

we can take any account) but all other solids conglomerated of those, or other species are difforme & unequall, as also  $y^e$  ingredients of all compositions, when by solution, they can be examined; from whence (as above) we argue to  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm state}$ of things universally, but with this re= serve, that there may be such simi= larity, aptitude, or other contingent cir= cumstances,  $w^{ch}$  in promiscuous action may be a means that bodys of certain formes & dimensions may gather toge= ther, & be distinguisht in groSs fluids or solids of various dispositions, as when things are severed by  $\texttt{cri}\{\underline{pbr}\}\texttt{ation}\text{, or}$ by y<sup>e</sup> tormenting furnaces of chymists whence are produced salts, sulphur, & diverse magisterys & corrosives  $w^{\rm ch}$ 

disperst

{\_}

(<del>210</del>) 79 Physica

dispers't in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  common fluids, or mixt with other conglomerate substances, are absconded, but  $y^{\rm e} et$  retaining  $y^{\rm e}$  very I= dentick substances, & minute formes, & capable by like mens to be brought together again & be denominated as before.

Before I drop this universall specula= tion if reall substances in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world, some matters must e considered; As frst that all things palpably known & dexa= minable, are found to consist of parts seemingly united together (ye manner is reserved to its place) but yet discerpable, & further, that all  $y^{\rm e}$  frusta^{88} that to us appear as parts, consist of minor parts, & by chymistry those are also found parta= ble & sic (for ought can be made appear) ad

67. Elementa= ry matter not disco= verable

### (211) Physica

ad infinitum; but so farr is certain that neither /by\ chymistry or other means, can we discover any bodys, or parts w<sup>ch</sup> are indiscerpable; Whence we may be assured that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Elementary state of things of  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$   $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  universe consists, lyes absconded in inconceivable minute= neSs; And that all discourses leaning upon any presupposed formes, & actions of elementary matter, such as y<sup>e</sup> Car= tesian &c. are unphilosophicall & vain; & all that can be conjected in that sphear, must fall in generalls, as may be vouched by a conformity with things palpable, & not in any subparticula= ritys whatever.

## Of Motion in fluido

It is now expedient that a poSsibility of motion in pleno should be further vin= dicated, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  vacuists fiercely deny it. I need only, with the old philosopher, to prove it, rise up & walk;89 for if any thing of a complex action be manifest to scence; it is ye ceSsion of fluids to con= globate bodys. moving in them;  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  manner of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  hath been partly described in another place; at present it is enough  ${\tt to}$ reconcile y<sup>e</sup> inconsistences urged against it, by shewing that if there were a ge= nerall, or intersperst vacuity yet things being crowded together as they are, it woud not help  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  case of motion, but it wou'd be (nearly)  $y^e$  same as if all our fluids

68 Motion in pleno vindica= ted.

80r

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>89</sup> Diogenes (c.412-c.323 BC) when asked what motion was stood up and left.

(<del>3</del>2143) Physica

fluids were (as we take them to be) plena= nary. And to instance in water; It is pro= ved that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts are contiguous, & that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  body is not further compreSsible by any force, & it is shewed also that it lyes un= der such perpetall compreSsure, not only by ye weight of its own body, of  $w^{\rm ch}~y^{\rm e}$  superior parts perpetually preSs  $y^{\rm e}$ inferior, but also by  $y^e$  weight of  $y^e$  bo= dy of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air that lyes upon it,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  by Torricellian experiment appears to be no trifle. And bodys sinkinkg & fishes swim= ming in water, must in some manner remove  $y^{\text{e}}$  substance of it, as  $\underline{y}^{\text{e}}\text{they paSs.}$ All  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is done by a force much inferi= or to that of  $y^e$  preSsure,  $w^{ch}$  brings  $y^e$  case to  $y^e$  same difficulty, as some ob=/ject\ in pleno {\_}}

{\_}}

### Physica

(<del>215</del>4) 81

in pleno; for if there was not an easy ceSsion of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter, as is most observable, opening before, & closing behind, things cou'd move no more (as fluids now are) than if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  vacuitys were granted, because  $y^e$  weaker (action) cou'd not prevail ag/st  $\$ y<sup>e</sup> stronger (compreSsion) when y<sup>e</sup> oppo= sition is so disproportionate; If ye fluid were to be moved quantity for quan= tity & in like time, I grant motion thro it were impoSsible. But it is not so, for  $y^e$  fluid stands upon a bal= lance of all its parts  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  are in conti= nuall motion (uniformly/{)} & a small force determing them (gradation) one way or other.  $\{\underline{A}\}$  equall weights in scales, were it 100<sup>11</sup> in each, will turn with a single ounce, & such is  $y^{\rm e}$  case of motion in fluido, w<sup>ch</sup> matter hath been

in part

{\_} {\_}

{\_}

69. great bodys leSs resisted by fluids than small (215) Physica

in part already noted, & will be further considered afterwards. But I must not omitt to answer a common but Idle allegation, that nothing can move till was is made by ceSsion of other matter, & (in fullneSs) that (as they say) cannot be; y<sup>e</sup> answer is that y<sup>e</sup> impulse & ceSsion {are eadem instante} are eadem instante,90 & (in fluidity) {it is} in circulo<sup>91</sup> as engins in turning all  $y^{\rm e}$  parts move & remove in  $y^{\text{e}}$  same instant, & it is  $y^{\text{e}}$  same case of an arrow,  $y^{\text{e}}$  head advanceth &  $y^{\text{e}}$  feathers follow altogether, & is  $/{}\$  that enough to answer so vain a scruple? if not con= sider that no part of ye fluid is carry= ed on, but all is left in its proper place.\*92 It being cleared that compound or large bodys will paSs thro fluids, it must be considered that it never is without some

<sup>90</sup> i.e., 'at the same time', or 'simultaneously'.

 $<sup>^{91}</sup>$  i.e., 'in a circle'. It is not clear what is meant here, perhaps MN is saying that engines continue to turn even when they are moved.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>92</sup> The cross/asterisk refers to a note in the LH margin of the next page.

#### Physica (<del>216</del>) 82

some (tho not a totall resistance of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ fluid against ye force with wch they paSs whereby  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  speed is continually abated; as in all cases when smaller bodys lye in  $y^{\rm e}$  way of greater bodys, & Gradually deprive all their velocity. And this resistance hath respect not only to  $y^{\rm e}$  condition of  $y^{\rm e}$  fluid, but also to ye magnitude of ye body that paSseth; I make no account of figure here, but suppose all to be alike as globes, (for instance); And then as to  $y^{\rm e}$  fluids, they are of diverse consistencys, &, as was observed, resist accordingly; as pitch melted resists more than water, & that more than air, & that (perhaps) more than either.93 And then, whatever y<sup>e</sup> fluid is, y<sup>e</sup> resistance is leSs effectuall against

\* for chipps and stra/ws\ paSs by, and are left behind in  $y^{\text{e}}$ same order (nearly) as they lay be= fore, &  $y^{\rm e}$  action is not a protru= sion, but a se= paration of y<sup>e</sup> fluid mat= ter, & what impediment that will be, will be consi= dered next.

 $<sup>^{93}</sup>$  It would make more sense here if we read 'ether' (or 'aether') for 'either'.

### (217) Physica

against great, than it is against small bodys according as  $y^{\rm e}$  substances hold proportion with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  superficies. The force of a moving body is gaged by  $y^e$  sub= stance, &  $y^{\rm e}$  resistance by  $y^{\rm e}$  superficies. And y<sup>e</sup> increase of force is triplicate as  $y^e$  cubes of  $y^e$  diameter, but of  $y^e$  as squares of it,  $w^{ch}$  is but duplicate; &  $y^{\rm e}$  like of decrease reverst,  $y^{\rm e}$  greater body diminishing looseth force as cubes but  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  superficies looseth by squares only, & (one woud think) may hold out longer than  $y^{\text{e}}$  substance, of  $w^{\text{ch}}$ notion some use may be made af= terwards. In  $y^{\text{e}}$  mean time, we are sure that y<sup>e</sup> course of small (coagulated) bodys thro' fluids are more resisted. (substance considered/{)} than greater & a body

{\_}

{\_}

(\_)

70. SwiftneSs belongs to small & not to great things Physica (<del>218</del>)

a body in respect to y<sup>e</sup> minute parts of a fluid {must} be so groSs that y<sup>e</sup> re= sistance of y<sup>e</sup> fluid against them shall be inconsiderable. All great things being leSs resistable & more pervicaci= ous in paSsing than small ones, where= of y<sup>e</sup> reason was touched before. W<sup>ch</sup> notion will resolve diverse phaenome= na of nature, as shall be shewed else= where.

As to y<sup>e</sup> intestine movement of fluid mat= ter, we can form no other Idea of it, than with analogy to things distin= guisht, & experimentable; because y<sup>e</sup> minuteneSs of matter flys all manner of sensible discovery. Therefore we must first imagine, that as sensible

things

(219) Physica

{\_}

things reall{\_\_} consist only of impene= trable matter, & that in every instance of contact, change of aspects & dis= tances, that is motions are governed by rules of dimension impulsive.  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{wWe}}$ have reason to conclude that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  least things (however indistinguishable) being impenetrable, & figurate are lyable to ye like consequences (in pro= portion) as are deducible from every contact, according to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rules before declared,  $\mathbf{w}^{\text{ch}}$  afford this difference that being minute they are more mobile, & so are  $y^{\rm e}$  more minute (continually) than greater things because they re= sist leSs. And it is observable in y<sup>e</sup> world, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  swiftest agitations are among

among  $y^{\rm e}$  smallest, &  $y^{\rm e}$  slower with  $y^{\rm e}$  lar= ger bodys,  $w^{\rm ch}~y^{\rm e}$  actions of animalls great & small plainly demonstrate. And that dif= ference (mentally) translated to  $y^e$  elementa= ry parts of common fluids, argues an in= conceivable swiftneSs, as well as minute= neSs of them. And in all that extream abceSs of matter, no one part moving e= ver toucheth another; but y<sup>e</sup> effects of mu= tuall impulse succeed. And considering  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  plenitude,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole divided materiall of  $y^{\rm e}$  world reciprocally acts & is actua= ted circuatim  $^{94}$  indefinitely. And there is nothing can be called rest, but only when two parts join & do not separate, (if any such happen) or if  $y^{\rm e}$  parts of  $y^{\rm e}$  same body,  $\{\underline{w}^{ch}\}$  always hold  $y^e$  same aspects & contigui= ty together. And we are not to be discou=/raged  $\$ in these

{\_}}

84r

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>94</sup> i.e., 'around it'.

#### Physica

221

in these speculations, because we do not (among sensibles) find anything conside= rably like to fluidity, for stones, sand, dust & impalpable powders lye quiet; But y<sup>e</sup> imagination may help, as supposing in a heap of stones, other stones, in y<sup>e</sup> intervalls shou'd fall into a rapid & shallking motion, such heap woud like water, fall into a levell, & by no means stand accumulated. But we have an experiment of solids, as I may call y<sup>e</sup> powder of Alabaster, y<sup>e</sup> consists of small stones, becoming, as it were, fluid, for that powder ofver y<sup>e</sup> fire will appear almost to boil.

Now to enter deeper into yethese poSsible, if not probable constitutions of ye com= mon fluids of ye world; They must consist of matter in parts of all variety of shapes and

71.
Motion acco=
modated by
interstitiall
matter.

85

& (imperceptible) magnitudes,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  are inter= mixt, & being together with matter it self (w^{ch} must be postulated), once, as at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ beginning of y<sup>e</sup> world, put into agitati= on, there will succeed a promiscuous ac= tion & paSsion,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts perpetually striking & being striken, & so rolling & interchan= ging all manner of ways; And it is impoSsible  $y^{\rm e}$  universall agitation shou'd cease wholly, tho' perhaps there may not be  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same modes or degrees in all places, but as  $y^{\rm e}$  matters & agitations vary,  $y^{\rm e}$ state there abouts may also be influ= enced. But is is not considerable to reflect on  $y^e$  [genius?] of  $y^e$  in[-?]terstitiall matter. That there is such & in all pla= ces of y<sup>e</sup> fluid world, may be concluded, because  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter is made up of irregular or perhaps

### (223) Physica

or perhaps some near to regular figures, w<sup>ch</sup> will require interstitial spaces to be frequent amongst them; And those must be filled with matter, of  $w^{ch} y^e$  like is still affirmed, & in  $y^{\rm e}$  same manner, of one order within another, as infinitum of minuteneSs; as I am about to shew, w<sup>ch</sup> accomodates all promiscuous action, it being scarce poSsible any place or space shou'd happen, & matter not be at hand to fill it. But in  $y^e$  mean time I must note that here I use  $y^e$  style of  $y^e$  vacuists, but according to our hypothesis, y<sup>e</sup> presu= med spaces are reall body & neither want nor admitt any other filling,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  sup= plants all objections of this nature, & so I go on.

Here waving  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  dispute of divisibility

72. Actuall infinity 86r of minute= neSs of matter of minute= neSs of matter

# Physica (224) 86

ad infinitum,  $w^{\rm ch}$  is now universally allow= ed, I insist further, & (upon like probabi= lity) affirm/; \ that there is actuall infi= nity of matter /small\ things; & as immensity of space, is without limit, so exility of di= vided space or (if you please) matter is also unlimited; both w<sup>ch</sup> cases y<sup>e</sup> mathe= maticians describe, by quovis dato major aut minor, 95 So that if any case is objec= ted of matter put into difficulty to move for want of acceSsion to accommodate, I can say as before that there may be smal= ler & smaller almost everywhere for supply,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  cannot be denyed, for actuall infinity includes no contradiction: And every state that can be invented or con= ceived for body, whether of form, action

or mag=/nitude\

 $<sup>^{95}</sup>$  i.e., 'larger or smaller than any given'.

(225) Physica

or magnitude, is poSsible penetration on= ly excepted. Whither parts may cohere or divide will be considered next; At pre= sent it is presumed that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ world, as well at large, as in  $y^{\rm e}$  intersti= tialls of conglomerates, consists of minutes, diversifyed, divided, unequall & actually more & more minuted, indefinitely & perpetually interspersing & moving with inconceivable agillity, & allways accor= ding to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rules of impulses. And it is not discovered that any composition can= confine or exclude  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  subtile matter in all places intersperst, but on  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  other side that it actually permeates  $y^{\rm e}$  clo= sest veSsels men can form any famili= ar Idea of, as to instance of air paSsing thro walls

### Physica.

thro walls of straw. And when quanti= tys seem to be confined, as in y<sup>e</sup> phneu= matick experiments whither exsucking or compreSsing, it is by way of vibration, when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  groSser substances only are detained, &  $y^{\rm e}$  more subtile paSs in or out freely. And what phaenomena may depend on y<sup>e</sup> contingent separations & various dispositions of  $y^{\rm e}$  subtile mat= ter of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world, may summarily be presumed afterwards. In  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  mean time, without violence to thought we may presume that (excuse a bold expreSsion)  $y^e$  universall world is com= pounded of infinitys unequall, diSsi= milar, & of incommensurate parti= cularitys.

The naturallists have been at a loSs how to

72.<sup>2</sup> Continuity of matter

a dark subject.

25<sup>96</sup>

how to resolve  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  continuity of matter, or compounds of many parts; Cartesius said by rest, but that answers not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ why or y<sup>e</sup> how. The atomists have said by Hamositys, but what holds  $y^{\rm e}$  parts of those hooks together, & sic ad infi= nitum? This made Le Clerk say that y<sup>e</sup> question is irresolvable because it ever returnes, but there is a better reason,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is that  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  cause is hid in extream minuteneSs. The Newtonians say by attraction w<sup>ch</sup> is ultimately strong in  $y^e$  contact, & so things hold together by a quality of holding together. It is certein that no experiment of this effect can be made in sensibles, & to work by analogys & poSsibiltys is but an infirm proceSs, & here  $y^{\rm e}$  subject is uncomfortable

Physica

(227)

#### Physica (228) 88

uncomfortable, Audendum tamen.<sup>98</sup> The question is pregnant of another, w<sup>ch</sup> is se= paration; It being no leSs abstruse to know how matter, being one, may be bro= ken, or divided into two, or more, than it is to discover what cement holds y<sup>e</sup> parts together.

And first of union, that{\_}is an oneneSs of{\_} materiall parts must be taken as a principle included in y<sup>e</sup> eSsence of bo= dy; for that is continuall, and hath no distinction but what results from mo= tion, w<sup>ch</sup> is eo nomine<sup>99</sup> a separation, & that only affords y<sup>e</sup> distinction of one thing from another. But it doth not follow that parts once devided, & coming toge= ther again, or diverse parts in contact

22.<sup>3</sup> of union & y<sup>e</sup> means {<u>there</u> <u>several</u>?}<sup>97</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>97</sup> (What I read as) 'there several', in pencil, in the margin, to the left of the section heading. It would seem that the words are to be entered into the text at the places marked by underlining. This pencilled-in writing, here and elsewhere, employs a distinctive greek 'e', leading us to ask whether, if the main text is in MN's hand, these comments might not be in another.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>98</sup> i.e., 'yet be bold'. *See* Quintilian *Institutione Oratoria*, Book 1, chapter 5, section 72; the phrase had been previously and famously used by Horace in Epistles I, 2.40. *See* also BL Add. MS 32546, f. 153r; also BL Add. MS 32545 29r and 202r, also note 38 in the biography page on this website, at http://www.ucl.ac.uk/north/bio.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</sup> i.e., 'by that name', i.e, 'by definition'.

### (229) Physica

{undevided}

must neceSsarily unite, & become one, tho' it is hard to shew a difference, be= tween such union, &  $y^{\rm e}$  coherence of matter originally {undeivided}. If  $y^e$  con= tact be by points there can be no co=  $% \left( {{{\left( {{{\left( {{{c}} \right)}} \right)}_{i}}}_{i}}} \right)$ hesion, for how Shou'd any thing lay hold cujus pars est nulla?100 therefore ye contact must be by superficies, & those may be either flatt, or curve; if flatt, we have a resemblance by flatt po= lished marbles,  $w^{ch}$  are found to cohere, so that in paral/e\lelism it is very hard to part them. The preSsure of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$   $\boldsymbol{A} t \boldsymbol{m} \boldsymbol{o} \boldsymbol{s} p \boldsymbol{h} \boldsymbol{e} \boldsymbol{r} \boldsymbol{e} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{r}$ (by a neceSsity of some Torricellian va= cuity in  $y^e$  middle) hath been exstee= med y<sup>e</sup> cause, but that hath been re= moved in y<sup>e</sup> exhausted receiver, & yet some
some cohesion remains. This cannot be by attraction, for in any other manner than paralell, y<sup>e</sup> peices will freely sepa= rate as either angularityly, or (friction considered) by sliding. But pure pleni= tude without preSsure will hold flatts in that manner together, for matter cannot succe/e\d in y<sup>e</sup> middle at y<sup>e</sup> same instant as at y<sup>e</sup> edges. Thus farr con= tact may joyn matter, so that it may not readily bye divided, & if we sup= pose a compage of flatt bodys tou= ching by superficies, & constituting a pyle of thousands, it is not conceiva= ble that these shoud part by any means or force but what is exter= nally & minutatim applyed,  $^{\rm 101}$  & for ought I know May be ye case of metta=/lls

& stones

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>101</sup> i.e., 'applyed bit by bit'.

(231) Physica

& stones, w<sup>ch</sup> magisterys will corrode, but force groSsly applyed, will not diSsolve; but there is a further inducement to think that plenitude hath a great share in cohersion, for if y<sup>e</sup> superfici= es are curve so as not to slide one way or other, or scarce be made to open an= gularly, y<sup>e</sup> bodys must cohere. And y<sup>e</sup> superficiall parts will not readily separate because of some preSsure from y<sup>e</sup> medium, & those must depart before y<sup>e</sup> rest can remove.

73. Of polished marbles & touch.

I do not mention this case of polished marbles as a clear instance of cohesi= on, but in gradu only,<sup>102</sup> for we know that what seems tous us a perfect flatt, is not truly so, but [rugged?] &, probably, touching more by points then by super=/ficies\ & y<sup>e</sup>

&  $y^{\rm e}$  subtiler matter that permeates all is in  $y^{\text{e}}$  way to impede much  $y^{\text{e}}$  nett contact, & facilitate  $y^{\rm e}$  separation, but if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  flatt were perfectly cotangent in all its parts, I cannot say /if any, \ what force (in a paralell state{)} woud part them; for it is not reasonable to distinguish between such touch &  $y^{\rm e}$  consistence of pure matter; It is some reason for cohesion of parts, that there is no spe= cificke gravity effectuall, between/en\  $y^{\rm e}$  component parts of a body &  $y^{\rm e}$  me= dium,  $w^{\rm ch}$  shoud cause such bodys that consist of parts supposed to be loose, to fall in pieces; Collections of groSs bodys in a pile of brick lifted up woud scatter, because  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts are much heavier, & wou'd fall thro  $y^e$  air; but if they

{\_}}

if they were as small as smoak they wou'd not separate by force of gravi= ty, so that ye image of falling in pie= ces is derived. of large and heavy bodys, & ought not to be transferred upon  $y^{\rm e}$ minute, that wou'd swim in the air as parts of steel do in a fluid menstru= [q<sup>u</sup>]<sup>103</sup>  $um^{104}$  of {  $\underline{w^{\rm ch}}$  } y^e compounds must dissolve gradually, and by apt means & not all at once, even Ice it self will not diSsolve but by superficiall operation Gra= dually. 74. Another cause of conglomerates is friction Of con= tion, for when parts are interwoven, glomera= as bricks & stones in masonry, admit= tion by ting there were no principle of cohe= friction sin, a body so composed coud not be broken without a mutuall fricture of y<sup>e</sup>

Physica

(233)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103</sup> RN uses this abbreviation (a lower-case 'q' with an indeterminable superscript letter, which I read as 'u') a number of times throughout the MSS. I read 'q<sup>U</sup>' (here, and elsewhere in the MSS) in agreement with Jamie C. Kassler (*Seeking Truth. Roger North's Notes on Newton and Correspondence with Samuel Clarke c. 1704-1713*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Farnham, 2014, p. 10) as an abbreviation of 'gaere' meaning 'enquire', or as we might say 'to be checked out'.

Physica

of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  separation,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{ch}$  demands some force to conquer, & this seems to be  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  case when a barr of iron is to be broken. This brings to my mind what hath been already advanced concerning  $y^{\rm e}$  fluidity of  $y^{\rm e}$  world at large, &  $y^{\rm e}$ matter collected about y<sup>e</sup> centers of y<sup>e</sup> vortexes w<sup>ch</sup> is of y<sup>e</sup> smallest sort, & also such as one of expanded shapes, y<sup>e</sup> former are most apt for fire, & y<sup>e</sup> others by reason of difform shapes most apt to impede each others mo= tion & so to coagulate; but there is no coagulum so strong compact but fire will get  $y^{\rm e}$  better & flux it, & when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fire that agitated  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter abates; ye part fall together & close in a coagulation, as may be perceived

by y<sup>e</sup>

(235) Physica

by y<sup>e</sup> naked eye, when mettalls are melted, & by degrees cool again. There= fore considering y<sup>e</sup> wonderful exility of divided matter, & y<sup>e</sup> infinite variety of shapes & dimensions, in our [regions?] , as I may say deformed, & of these com= positions upon compositions, & sub com= positions indefinitHely, we need not launch beyondmd y<sup>e</sup> commond mecha= nick rules of corporeall impulses, or invent powers or quallitys, to de= rive a poSsibillity of minute bodys coagulating into such lumps, & so va= riously, as we are in common life concerned with.

75. The cases of disunion more ob= tuse Physica (<del>236</del>) 92

never were divided. This I take to be a coalition rather than a conjunction,  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\&}}$  now whether such bodys, either simple or united, may by any force be broken or separated, is a question much har= der to resolve than  $y^{\rm e}$  former of uni= ting. It is certain that y<sup>e</sup> conceipt of Cartesius that ye Globuli or Aether be= come round by motion wearing away  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  unevenneSs, is vain for so all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole matter must become (greater or smaller) Globules  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is contrary to his own scheme. But there is no experiment, not so much as in Idea, whence to inferr a deter= mination of this question; only thus much must be affirmed that if matter were not

75.<sup>(2)</sup> Materi= all parts not indis= cerpable

### Physica

237

were not hard, that is not partable without some force, there cou'd not be ye like in compounds. And then if any force will divide matter, What hinders that every force may not do it, for we find nothing to determine any degrees? This hath inclined many to Conclude that origi= nall matter is indiscerpable by any force. I cannot altogether come into this, for it is hard to say  $\boldsymbol{y}^{t}$  matter may unite but by no means divide, I believe it may well be thought that no direct, or nearly direct impulse will break an intire substance, because  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force is by yielding complyed with. But when obliquity is considered, y<sup>e</sup> extreams may be such as no person can suppose a

resistance

#### Physica (238) 93

resistance sufficient to sustein an im= pulse without a fracture. As if A were a part of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  earth globe, such as a common obdurate rock is, & at y<sup>e</sup> sum= mit a spike C of originall matter were fixed & a shot B, from a cannon come a= gainst it at BC. It is not in our power to imagine that ye ball shou'd reflect, & ye spike at c not break, or to carry y<sup>e</sup> point further, altho y<sup>e</sup> spike were ex= treamly leSsend. tThese considerations compell us to opine that matter is dis= cerpable provided a sufficient force falls mechanically upon it, tending to sepa= rate one part from another, & he that ascertains those requisites erit mihi magnus Apollo.<sup>105</sup> But as a opinion only, I say that there is not & never was or will

<sup>105</sup> i.e., 'he shall be my great Apollo', referring to Virgil's *Bucolica/Eclogue* III, 104 (properly 'eris mihi magnus Apollo', as the source is in the second person) (239) Physica

or will be any part of matter so cir= cumstanced that any impulse or force that can happen to fall upon it shall discerp any part of it. For if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ forms are compact, & not wiredrawn out, as may not be supposed,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  yeilding of  $y^e$  impuls{ers} one way and other, will prevent fracture. And in y<sup>e</sup> breaking of compounds y<sup>e</sup> divisions are most like= ly to fall between  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm compound}\ ({\rm ra=}$ ther than upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  originall) parts. And  $y^{\text{e}}$  wonderfull tenacity of threads & wires &c shews that there is a principle in  $y^e$ matter that small forces such as our imaginary attraction will not work upon: But we seldom or never reflect, that all character or judgement of hu= man force, (& thereby of other powers) is comparative

{\_}}

comparative; we attribute all to our selves, as when a weight is great, it is as true, tha{t p}ower is little, but we {\_} choose  $y^{\rm e}$  former estimation,  $w^{\rm ch}$  is de= rived upon a partiallity or flattery of our selves, & hence most of our won= derments proceed, as all our great, mighty, & other superlatives, are of things wch  $\{\underline{out}\}$  contrarily to be of our {<u>also</u>} selves as  $\{/\$  if we said small, weak, & other diminutives,  $w^{\rm ch}$  I think more acco= ding to nature than  $y^{\text{e}}$  other, & tend to a better judgement of union & se= paration of matter, especially {ye latter, {\_}} that is} tenacity wch is (by no means)( (attraction,) or otherwise resolvable, & if this be not enough to say upon  $y^{\rm e}$ subject, I shall freely own that I cannot, & believe (241) Physica

& believe that few (if any) can to y<sup>e</sup> purpose say more. And that if I have not proved that every thing in these pa= pers is true (excuse y<sup>e</sup> braggadochio) I shall most willingly go a great way to meet any one who shall prove any of them false.

The Stellary world.

76. The Ideas of immen= sity

Hitherto of matters introductory viz: principles, mechanicalls & some gene= rall considerations of body, without meddling without sensi<del>ble</del>/tive\ Ideas, or com= mon fantasmes, residing not in things, but in y<sup>e</sup> imagination only w<sup>ch</sup> kindle, subsist & dye with animall life; as sound, colours, tast, smell, soft, rugged, & y<sup>e</sup> like, with y<sup>e</sup> operations occasionall of such

# Physica (<del>242</del>) 95

of such Ideas; as fire, rarefaction [levity?] con= con= densation, gravity, levity, fluidity, me= teors, & other complex phaenomena; All= w<sup>ch</sup> depending upon minuteneSs might be aptly called upon here; But I pro= pose (rather than seem over hasty) to discontinue y<sup>e</sup> present course, & set on again at y<sup>e</sup> other extream immen= sity, comprising  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  utmost extent of our discoverys. And in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  discSsing of those matters, some usefull opportunitys may occurr for resolving physically, as well  $y^e$  near as also  $y^e$  /more\ remote objects, by  $y^e$ analogys  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  may appear in  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  works of nature universally; & then  $y^{\rm e}$  stage will be clear for exposing some ab= strusitys in particulars  $w^{\rm ch}\text{,}$  not without reason we [requitred?] insoluble. And now we

{<u>now</u>}

77 The mun= dane space infinite (243) Physica

we must invest  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  course of our ima= gination, w<sup>ch</sup> before tended to advance imperceptibles into a state examina= ble, by magnifying: And  $\{ \underline{/ \setminus} \}$   $y^e$  same pre= rogative must be imployed to reduce y<sup>e</sup> incomprehensibles into a sensible compaSs, by diminishing them; & who= ever hath not a command of all Ideas of dimension (saving proportions) & a power to schematise them in his mind, as representations are usually drawn upon paper, can never have either a just notion of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  naturall world, nor pleasure in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  speculation of it, & ought to imploy his thoughts upon other matters.

The intire extent of y<sup>e</sup> mundane space is most reasonably supposed to be infinite; what Physica

(<del>244</del>) 96

what  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ancients thought to be limits, that is, solid orbs, are found to be null; some carryed their thoughts further, & fell into y<sup>e</sup> conceipt of an empyre= um,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  must of course be unlimited. And now  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  moderns having confounded  $y^{\rm e}$  solid orbs, with all  $y^{\rm e}$  vain adjunct of epicycles, there seems to be an u= niversall agreement to open y<sup>e</sup> scene of infinite space quaquaversum, 107 un= leSs we may exempt ye Idiotae, as ye un= learned have been styled. And why shoud any one dream of limitt/s\ when no kind or symptom thereof appears. Actuall infinitys immense & minute include no contradiction. And then what is more consonant to religion, than that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  works of  $y^e$  almighty shoud be deemed infinite?

The sensible

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>107</sup> i.e., 'in all directions'.

78. Of y<sup>e</sup> fixed starrs & y<sup>e</sup> sun.

### (245) Physica

The sensible Idea of this infinite space, is as of an hemisphear upon y<sup>e</sup> plane of  $y^{\text{e}}$  horizon, in  $y^{\text{e}}$  center of w<sup>ch</sup> we seem to stand; & where sight fails to distinguish, men fancy limits: for distances are judged by comparison, & that requires somewhat presupposed, or known. The most eminent object that this immense space presents to our senses is  $y^e$  sun; &  $y^e$  Epicureans judging, as of a picture, by meer view, decla= red  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun to be no larger than as it seemed to be. But astronomic expe= riment have shewed  $y^{\text{e}}$  immensity of it by perspectives & discovered to to be above 12000 semidiameters of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  earths globe distant from it.  $^{\rm 108}$  In  $y^{\rm e}$  absence of  $y^{\rm e}$ sun as in y<sup>e</sup> night, there appear to us other originall luminarys called starrs of various

<sup>108</sup> An example of the best knowledge available in the early eighteenth century is the estimate provided by the Italian astronomer Giovanni Cassini (1525-1712) from 1650 Professor at Bologna, and from 1659 Director of the Paris Observatory. He used trigonometry to estimate a distance of 140,000,000 km. This distance is nowadays extimated at 149,597,870,700 kms. Using MN's terms and our own measure of the earth's radius we get 6378.1 km x 12000 = 76,537,200 kms. This is only half of Cassini's figure, suggesting that perhaps MN meant to say a *diameter*, rather than a semidiameter of the earth.

of various (apparent) magnitudes, sprin= kled about in a manner contingent, & without any order or regular disposi= tion, &  $w^{\rm ch}$  never alter their mutuall as pects & distances, no more than their res= pective magnitudes, Saving only some comets, & some few starrs growing & de= caying of w<sup>ch</sup> more when we come to ye celestiall systeme. The like experi= ments have demonstrated that this or= der of luminarys are from us posited at  $\{\underline{an}\}\$  unconceivable dist $\{\underline{an}\}$ ce $\{\underline{s}\}$ , with respect to  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$   $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  sun, its distance & all that belongs to it, are almost of no di= mension. So that there is no means to discover whither ye apparent magnitudes are so unequall by means of more or leSs quantity, ir by distance, but proba= bly both, altho we cannot but gueSs by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  view that distance is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  chief cause of y<sup>e</sup> diminution

{\_}

### (247) Physica

 $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  diminution, & that it goes on till many are but just discernable, & ma= ny not at all (singly) but in nebulae, as  $y^{\rm e}$  galaxies &c The secrets of  $w^{\rm ch}$  are discovered by telescopes, & as  $y^{\rm e}$  ordinary course of imagination, is to reiterate distances indefinitely, so here now we may conceive an ultraneous proceSs of lumi= narys, that wou'd, like landscapes rising one byeyond another (in case we might travell farr enough) appear to us: And it is judged that ye sunn resident in this common immensity is like one of those starrs; And at like distance from any of them, as those are from each other, woud appear as a starr & any other near enough as a sun.

This I take to be  $y^e$  most reasonable Idea of  $y^e$  wide world. I mean as to so much of it as appears to us fixed, or never

interchanging

79.
0f planets
& their
courses

#### Physica (<del>249</del>) 98

interchanging either distances or aspects, altho y<sup>e</sup> objects discernable are magnifyed somewhat by y<sup>e</sup> help of Telescopes; but that cannot be much because ye vi= suall angle of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  magnitudes at such immane distances, run almost into a strait line, & so are near lost. But a= mongst these fixt luminarys (seeming= ly) there are a few others called planets or wanderers, 109 that judging by relation to y<sup>e</sup> former appear to us perpetually changing place, except at some short stationary times; These are all found to be solid & globular, & seen, not by originall light as  $y^{\text{e}}$  fixed starrs but, only by  $y^{\rm e}$  sunns light reflecting from them, to  $w^{\rm ch}$  they are comparatively near. And their wandrings are also found to be nearly regular in orbits amost cir= cular, having  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun near to  $y^{\text{e}}$  center of their

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>109</sup> The word 'planet' derives from the Greek  $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\eta\varsigma$  (plánēs) meaning 'wanderer'. It was given to the planets because they appeared to wander against the background of fixed stars. Their movement was only finally explained by the Copernican model of a heliocentric solar system (... or rather: in seeking to explain the movement of the planets Copernicus ..., etc.).

(249) Physica

of their courses, & more stricktly observed appear to be short ellipticks, &  $y^{\rm e}$  sun to be in or near  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  focall points. And these formes are not so mathematicall as most astronomers presume, but being subject to y<sup>e</sup> common law of irregularity, ne= ceSsarily attendant upon all naturall principles, do admitt of a fere or quam proxime to /in\ all  $y^e$  calculates that be= long to them.<sup>110</sup> And of these, y<sup>e</sup> orbits more remote from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun turn slower than those nearer, & therefore shew leSs irre= gularity, &  $y^{\rm e}$  nature of these planets is best known by analogy with y<sup>e</sup> earth, upon  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  we live, for that is found to be globular also, & to make one in  $y^{\text{e}}$  coursing (like  $y^{\text{e}}$  other planets about ye sun. And this earth of ours, be= sides such course,  $w^{\rm ch}$  is called annuall, as we observe its relation to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fixed starrs, in that

#### Physica (<del>250</del>)

in that period makes about 365 revo= lutions from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  west eastwards, upon a proper axis, obliq to  $y^{\text{e}}$  plane of the/e\ annuall about 23°; these are days in each year, w<sup>ch</sup> subdevided into [....?]24 x 60 x 60 &c are ye hours, minutes, seconds &c. These period $\{\underline{s}\}$  being of our continuall acquaintance, are used for ye common measures of all ye other planetary revolutions, altho nothing commensurate is found amongst them. The order of those beginning with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$ nearest to  $y^{\rm e}$  sun is (1) Mercury  $w^{\rm ch}$  re= volves in 3 months, (2) Venus in 8 months. (3)  $y^{\rm e}$  earth in 12 months or one year (4) Mars in 2 years (5) Jupiter in 12 years & (6) Saturn in 30 years, all from west, eastwards. The orbit of  $y^{\text{e}}$  earth (to sence) is  $y^{\text{e}}$  path of  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun & called  $y^{\rm e}$  ecliptick, thos of  $y^{\rm e}$  planets swerve

{\_}}

	(251) Physica
	swerve, but not much, from that, & y <sup>e</sup> croSsings are called y <sup>e</sup> nodes, of all w <sup>ch</sup> courses y <sup>e</sup> whole sweep is called y <sup>e</sup>
	Zodiack. The bodys of these planets
	with their forms & distinctions appear
	to us in telescopes plain enough, altho
	to our bare sight they are but as starrs,
	not much exceeding those of y <sup>e</sup> prime
	magnitudes. And by y <sup>e</sup> apparent mag=
	nitudes, & y <sup>e</sup> times of revolution, y <sup>e</sup> pla=
	netary distances from y <sup>e</sup> sun, & y <sup>e</sup> mu=
	tuall aspects of them, are (not much
{_}	out of y <sup>e</sup> way)) { <del>gueSst}</del> gueSsed at. But as
{ <u>nor_distances</u> }	to y <sup>e</sup> fixed starrs neither magnitu{ <u>des/\</u> } are
	accounted for, because their [vissive?] an=
	gle even in telescopes, becomes (as I said)
	tantum non <sup>111</sup> a strait line, & discover
	scarce any dimension. But it is pre=
{ <u>that</u> }	sumed{ //} from $y^e$ nearest of $y^e$ fixt starrs,
	y <sup>e</sup> whole solar systeme woud seem, but as

one of

Physica

(<del>252</del>) 100

one of them seems to us, a meer speck of light, & it is most rationally conjectured that  $y^e$  fixt starrs are all sunns, & proba= bly circumstipated with planets: These contemplations are apt to stir up admi= ration at  $y^e$  immensity of  $y^e$  world { $\frac{w^{ch}}{}$ }ra= ther belongs to  $y^e$  exility of human kind. for magnitudes saving proportion are all alike.

But to return, we have yet reflected only upon y<sup>e</sup> primary planets attendant upon y<sup>e</sup> sun, there remains to account for y<sup>e</sup> state of each of them in particular, w<sup>ch</sup> will introduce y<sup>e</sup> severall orders of subplanets, such as y<sup>e</sup> moon coursing about y<sup>e</sup> earth, y<sup>e</sup> 4 satellites or moons about Jupiter, & 5 at y<sup>e</sup> least about Saturn. None being yet discovered to attend either mars, Venus, or Mercury. And somewhat is

is observable

{<u>Immensity</u> <u>in y<sup>e</sup> Idea</u>}

80. Of y<sup>e</sup> same & subpla= nets

(253)

#### Physica

observable of each of these. But first of  $y^{\rm e}$  sun,  $y^{\rm e}$  substance of  $w^{\rm ch}$  is most ra= tionally by all symptomes, concluded to be a body of pure fire, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  maculae (apparently) paSsing upon y<sup>e</sup> surface, or not far from it, argue smoak, & y<sup>e</sup> faculae,<sup>112</sup> continuall eruptions of fresh fire, as we see in furnaces upon y<sup>e</sup> ac= ceSsion of fresh fuel, or like Aentna & vesuvio  ${\ensuremath{\scriptscriptstyle \bullet}} at$  times, when  $y^e$  fire rages, & there is like reason to conceive that  $\mathbf{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  whole luminary may consist of in= numerable & perpetuall fiery eruptions all over it, & if there be any intersperst darkneSses, they are absorpt by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  surroun= ding light, so that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  whole, at  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  immense distance from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth cannot appear otherwaise than as an even light, like that of melted glaSs or iron, Wch near (If we

```
^{112} i.e., the (respectively) dark and bright spots apparently on the sun's surface.
```

## Physica (<del>254</del>) 101

(If we may give scope to fancy) wou'd appear as mountains & seas perpetually eructing fire & exploding with tremendous noises of infinite horror. When barely reflected on. But ye more certain conclusion, is that ye body of ye sun rolls about an axis, as ye planets from west towards east /in\ about seven days. For ye paSsing of ye maculae plainly demonstrate it, as also that ye body of ye sun its round, because ye perspective rule takes place in ye form & spaces of their paSsage, as spotts upon any turning globe ar discerned, or as if they are pictured upon a projecti= on of it.

There is little to be remarked of  $y^e$  planets Mercury or venus, only that their orbitts being leSs than that of  $y^e$  earth, they are never seen far from  $y^e$  sun, not at

any time

81. Of venus & mercury

(255)

Physica

any time to surround  $y^{\rm e}$  body of  $y^{\rm e}$  earth, as Mars, Jupiter, & Saturn, (by reason their orbitts are larger than that of  $y^{\rm e}$  earth) allways do. Venus is more observable than Mercury,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  for  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  most part is hid under  $y^{\text{e}}$  light of  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun; And  $y^{\text{e}}$  phase of \*Venusoften appears falcated & Gibbous, as y<sup>e</sup> luminated part is more or leSs obverted towards us. But it is very remarkable of  ${\bf \forall} Venus,$  that  $y^e$  phase is as smooth & lucid as GlaSs whereas  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  more remote planets upon &their phases have various pbscuritys. Some think that Venus is en= veloped in a perpetuall coloud; & ye fi=  $\mathtt{nallists}^{\mathtt{113}}$  say it is a provision to keep  $y^{\mathtt{e}}$ planet cool, & thereby habitable, w<sup>ch</sup> so near y<sup>e</sup> sun without a screen cou'd not be. I have not found that without /altho  $y^e$  ter= minations of light & shade upon  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  body of Venus

<sup>113</sup> 'Finalism', definition 2: "The doctrine that natural processes (e.g. evolutionary changes) are directed towards some end or goal." (OED online, accessed March 20, 2015).

Physica (<del>256</del>) 102

of +Venus, are by  $y^e$  telescopes plainly dis= covered; yet that any ruggedneSs in  $y^{\rm e}$  junc= ture, by  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  a mountanous state, as of y<sup>e</sup> moon, is arguable, ever appeared, I have not heard,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  favours  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  former opinion. The planet Mars  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  nearest to us, hath an obscure cingulum, (&(so Jupiter divers) & that neer ye plan of ye Zodiack. And Mars compaSsing both earth & sun, is sometimes very near to us, & as often very farr off, even beyond  $y^{\rm e}$ sun; And thereby  $y^{\rm e}$  anomala or disor= ders of his course seen from y<sup>e</sup> earth, are more egregiously observable than those of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  other more remote planets. And it may be presumed that he doth not turn because he hath no visible satellites therefore problably none at all, nor any other sign of rotation.

The earth

[2?]82
Of y<sup>e</sup> earth
& its alte=
rations

(259) Physica.

The earth is best known to us  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{byecause}}$  we live upon it, & being manifestly in y<sup>e</sup> or= der of planets that surround  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun, is sample by w<sup>ch</sup> we judge ythe state of y<sup>e</sup> rest. That  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is most observable of it is first  $y^{\text{e}}$  annuall course, or circle about  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun,  $w^{\rm ch}$  we call  $y^{\rm e}$  ecliptick, &  $y^{\rm e}$  return of it to y<sup>e</sup> same point, & is, in time, a year. But more is required to show  $y^e$  difference of seasons, as summer & winter, & that is derived of 2 concurrents one is y<sup>e</sup> li= bration, where by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  polar parts allways respect  $y^{\rm e}$  same point of  $y^{\rm e}$  heavens, &  $y^{\rm e}$ other is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rotation, that is upon an axis from pole to pole; of  $w^{\rm ch}$  (rotations) there are 365 in one annuall  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  are our days & nights, &  $y^{\rm e}$  axis of this rotation being obliq, to y<sup>e</sup> plane of y<sup>e</sup> annuall,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  poles of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth are inlightened half yearly, &  $y^{\rm e}$  adjacent parts of  $y^{\rm e}$  earth are light

light & dark succeSsively every revolve; y<sup>e</sup> obliquity is to an angle of (about) 23 degrees. Hence it follows as I said that each extremity of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  axis, called  $y^{\rm e}$  poles, enjoy  $y^{\rm e}$  light, & are as to  $y^{\rm e}$  sunns presence dark half  $y^{\rm e}\ year$  alternately, & in generall y<sup>e</sup> nights & days become unequall, & are equall only half-year= ly, when y<sup>e</sup> luminary in y<sup>e</sup> ecliptick paSseth (seemingly)  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm middle}\ {\rm circle}\ {\rm of}$  $y^{\text{e}}$  globe,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is at equall distance from both  $y^{\text{e}}$  poles, & is called  $y^{\text{e}}$  equinoctiall. The two circles paralell to this at y<sup>e</sup> ex= tremitys of of  $y^{\rm e}$  declination of  $y^{\rm e}$  ec= liptick are called  $y^{\rm e}$  tropicks, & by  $y^{\rm e}$  2 contact points, called  $y^{\rm e}$  solstitialls,  $y^{\rm e}$  sun in appearance marks out  $y^{\rm e}$  longest & shortest days alternately; & y<sup>e</sup> sun is ne= ver verticall to any point of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  globe but between  $y^{\rm e}$  2 tropicks. Nor at  $y^{\rm e}$  poles ever higher

(259) Physica

ever higher than 23 degrees above  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ horizon. The diurnall rotation yields ye same phaenomenon as wou'd be if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth stood still, &  $y^{\rm e}$  heavens moved,  $w^{\rm ch}$  makes our common speech between both am= biguous & some importune people, fond of y<sup>e</sup> latter, say that it cannot be de= monstrated that ye same is not true. But that is not  $y^{\text{e}}$  point,  $y^{\text{e}}$  motion in our sence is a non ers,<sup>114</sup> and nothing is true but relation,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is in one, other or neither; And it is nonsence to affirm more than that as= pects change. But if y<sup>e</sup> maSs of infinity be let in, & an originall cause respected, I presume  $y^{\rm e}$  motive impulse when  $y^{\rm e}$ same was first inflicted, wou'd not be supposed to have fallen upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  infinity but upon y<sup>e</sup> petit parcell w<sup>ch</sup> compara= tively is next to nothing

Of ye poles/The earths present\

Physica (<del>260</del>) 104

83 Of y<sup>e</sup> poles of y<sup>e</sup> world & universall magnetisme

The earths present state with regard to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ sun, is secured by one wonderfull pro= perty,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  I termed  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  libration, & is that  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$ diurnall axis (almost) always respects a certain place or point in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  heavens (seemingly) at an infinite distance; whereby ye axis, how ever obiq to ye plane of y<sup>e</sup> ecliptick, in all y<sup>e</sup> annuall course, maintains a perpetuall paralellism with it self (quam proxime)<sup>115</sup> as if a magnetiq needle were set to swim u= pon a rolling surface of mwater,  $y^{\rm e}$ length of it woud alway continue in paralellism. This made  $M^r$  Gilbert<sup>116</sup> con= clude that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  globe of earth was but one great magnett, & respected  $y^{\rm e}$  north & south poles with its axis, by  $y^{\rm e}$  same means as rules  $y^{\rm e}$  needle, & every leSser magnett

<sup>115</sup> i.e., 'or near enough'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>116</sup> William Gilbert (1544-1603), physician, mathematician and astronomer, author of *De Magnete*, *Magneticisque Corporibus*, et de Magno Magnete Tellure, London, 1600.

#### (261) Physica

magnett. And  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  behaviour of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  needle when free shews  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  conformity, for in sailing farr towards  $y^{\rm e}$  north,  $y^{\rm e}$  compaSs= fly dipps (as they calle it) & from thence a hint was taken to mak  $\underline{y^{\text{e}}}\ inclinatory$ needles,  $w^{ch}$  tho not steddy, incline enough to shew that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  magnett point not in regular order, nor to ye horizon on= ly. But under  $y^{\rm e}$  poles wou'd stand with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  axis upwright. This polarity seems to be universall, in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  region of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  sun at least, & argues some principle no leSs spacious,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  acts upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  [calibeats?] in & about  $y^{\rm e}$  planets, & is not, & its feared never will be well /clearly  $\ \mbox{understood},\ \mbox{nor}\ \mbox{known}$ how farr it extends. But as to ye aecono= my of  $y^{\rm e}$  magnett respecting  $y^{\rm e}$  earths globe it is a spacious subject & ye pro= per authors are to be consulted.

It is now time to take notice of y<sup>e</sup> earth's subplanet

64. of y<sup>e</sup> moon

subplanet  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  moon; this is much leSs than  $y^e$  body of  $y^e$  earth &c. but  $y^e$  nearneSs makes it seem much larger than y<sup>e</sup> other pla= nets; y<sup>e</sup> apparent magnitude is almost as that of  $y^{\rm e}$  sun, by  $y^{\rm e}$  light of  $w^{\rm ch}$  re= flected it is seen; & by vertue of that is so conspicuous as to be accounted y<sup>e</sup> 2<sup>d</sup> lu= minary of y<sup>e</sup> heavens. The Telescopes have given so precise an account of it, that no person doubts of its being a globous maSs, such as we live upon, with ye like or rather greater asperitys upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  surface. It compaSseth y<sup>e</sup> earth in about 28 days & being without any rotation, allways shews  $y^{\rm e}$  same phase to us, &  $y^{\rm e}$  same aspects towards ye north, wch is enough to perswade us that both polarity, & gra= vity take place there. The description of its phase is in Hevelius's Selenography, & y<sup>e</sup> astronomy of it in Keplers's Volva,<sup>117</sup> who

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>117</sup> Johannes Hevelius (1611-87), Polish politician, administrator and astronomer. His *Selenographia*, *sive Lunae descriptio*, Dantzig, 1647, was illustrated with his own engravings. It represented four years of study made from his own observatory in Dantzig. Many of Hevelius's names and characterisations of lunar features are still employed. Like Hooke's *Micrographia* which gives an account of the microscope used, Hevelius's text also gives an account of the design and use of his instruments and telescopes. Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), was a German mathematician, astrologer and astronomer living in Prague and Linz. His *Somium* (or *Dream*), was first circulated in manuscript and combined a fantasy, told as a dialogue, describing a voyage to the moon. It contained a section of not so fantastical, non-geocentric observations describing the solar system according to the Copernican account, but imagined as being made from the moon. In the text the moon is called 'Levania' and the Earth 'Volva', hence MN's reference. The *Somnium* was eventually published in a much transformed version in 1634 by Kepler's son. Before entrusting it to the world at large, Kepler senior had thought it wise to add footnotes to explain that it was an allegory and not a record of witchcraft.

(263)

#### Physica

who explaine  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  appearances of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  heavens there, & that is as  $y^{\rm e}$  body of  $y^{\rm e}$  moon shews to us, so  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth shews to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  moon, but (as a clock) rotatile<sup>118</sup> and very much larger. The course of that planet & of  $y^{\rm e}$  earths rotation, being nearly  $y^{\rm e}$  same way, & as all  $y^{\rm e}$  other planets move from west east= wards, tho not in  $y^{\rm e}$  same track but within ye compaSs of ye Zodiack, (altho ye earth rolling deviates /even\ from that considerably) argue some common influence, that ab origine  $^{119}$  hath determined, & holds them in their severall courses, as I shall shew after<del>rw</del>/w\ards. But in y<sup>e</sup> mean time, as to  $y^{\text{e}}$  rotation of  $y^{\text{e}}$  earth,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is of all  $y^{\text{e}}$  most declined from  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  ecliptick, I must ascribe that greater declination to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  common magnetism; for it is impoSsible y<sup>e</sup> earth shou'd roll upon any other axis than that wch ye polarity lays hold on & keeps almost fast to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>118</sup> i.e., 'rotating'.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 119}$  i.e., 'since the beginning'.

Physica (<del>2</del>

(<del>265</del>) 106

fast to y<sup>e</sup> station. If y<sup>e</sup> polarity shoud vary, y<sup>e</sup> axis must follow, & perhaps cause grea= ter irregularitys in y<sup>e</sup> moons course, than any altho enough are known at present.

The next step is over Mars (mentioned before) to Jupiter, w<sup>ch</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> fairest & largest of all ye planets, Immensely larger than ye earth, & instead of one, ye earths portion, hath four moons but discernable by us only with telescopes. Those are called  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ Satellites, or, for flattery of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Tuscan family,  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  Mediceans. The phase of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ planet appears large, The phase of  $y^{\rm e}$  /& distinguished\ [.....?] by some thinn obscuritys or cingulums;  $^{\rm 120}$ & y<sup>e</sup> Mediceans very observable in their motions,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  as all other planets, tend from ye west eastwards. And so regularly, as to constitute a circumJoviall, as so= lemn as  $y^{\rm e}$  circumsolar astronomy, with Ephemerides, Eclipses, occultations transitive. And if

 $^{\rm 120}$  i.e., 'belts' – the visible surface of Jupiter's upper atmosphere is characterised by banded patterns.

85. Of Jupiter y<sup>e</sup> Sattell= ites & ro= tations

(266)

Physica

And if there might be a constant & steddy recourse to this planet, without  $y^e$  Helia= call settings, cloudy nights, toSsings at sea &c w<sup>ch</sup> impede y<sup>e</sup> observations, there needed no other help for rectifying, if not for finding  $y^e$  true longitudes  $\Theta f$  /in all\ places upon earth, for y<sup>e</sup> eclipses being a privation of light are momentaneous, & y<sup>e</sup> same to all places, & however ye horary account may vary, do [.?]mark an universall; 121 Now. The vertuosi are pleased by like means, to compute  $y^{\rm e}$  time of lights paSsing from Jupiter to us. For  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  eclipse or emession, happening, as they say it doth a few minutes beside  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  prediction, that inter= vall is  $y^e$  time,  $w^{ch}$  being allowed their calculations will fall fejust (fère).<sup>122</sup> To this I shall say only at present that y<sup>e</sup> time & distance being compared, y<sup>e</sup> former may justly stand for nothing

at all

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>121</sup> i.e., were it always observable, Jupiter could be used as a clock to tell the time wherever you were on Earth, enabling voyagers to compute their longitude. John Harrison (1693-1776) invented a chronometer reliable enough for measuring longitude soon after this was written, in 1737.
### Physica (<del>267</del>) 107

at all; but more at this when we fall upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  subject of light. The Zodiack of these subplanets lys near to a pa= ralellism with y<sup>e</sup> plane of our eclip= tick; And that gives great suspicion that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$   $% \boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planet turns upon an axis, if not at right angles, yet not much declining, & that subject to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  common law of magnetism, whereof ye condition of our earth is a notorious example. And I do not see why  $y^{\rm e}\mbox{ cingulum of}$ Mars, being always in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same position, or near it, may not be an argument that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planett, is held in its positure by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same universall influence: And altho it is reasonable to opine that it turns round, if  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  desolation of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  back side, w<sup>ch</sup> otherwise never or very rarely sees  $y^{\rm e}$  sun (&  $y^{\rm e}$  like as to Saturn, Venus, & Mercury,) may be an argument (a

finali

### (268) Physica

finali)<sup>123</sup> to rescue one half of each of those worlds from eternall or most tedious nights. But these considerations are more speculation than (as we pro= feSs) physicall, but it is hoped at such distances somewhat ultra may be in= dulged.

The next & last of y<sup>e</sup> planets is Saturn w<sup>ch</sup> lyes without all y<sup>e</sup> rest at an immense distance beyond Jupiter; y<sup>e</sup> true state of it was a discovery of this last cen= tury, & not before; when it was looked upon only as a common wandring starr, a tricorporeall as was thought. Now it is found that y<sup>e</sup> Globe of it is invironed by a solid substantiall ring, leaving a space between that & y<sup>e</sup> body, of about 1/3 of y<sup>e</sup> diameter of y<sup>e</sup> latter, & containing more quan= tity than y<sup>e</sup> planet it self contains. The plane

Of Saturn y<sup>e</sup> annulis & Satellites

## Physica (<del>269</del>) 108

plane of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ring doth not decline much from y<sup>e</sup> plane of our equinoctiall. And there is an order of subplanets, of 5, some say more, these move near y<sup>e</sup> plane of y<sup>e</sup> ring as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  satellites of Jupiter, but at greater distances; &  $y^{\rm e}$  observation of them being much more rare & scrupulous than of y<sup>e</sup> others,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  like use cannot be made of them. The condition of this planet is so rare & singular, as may tempt us to fancy more varietys among y<sup>e</sup> celestial incognita than have been imagined; for who cou'd have dream't of such an annulus in ye heavens, before  $y^e$  telescopes plainly dis= covered it? & even now it is a matter of  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$ greatest irregularity & wonder; some fi= nallists have conceipted, that as at Venus, clouds for refrigeration, so at Saturn, y<sup>e</sup> ring for calefaction, were purposely ordai/ned  $\!$ But a<del>s</del>t

(270)

Physica

But at  $\underline{\texttt{if}} y^e$  latter if  $y^e$  reflection helps one way, perhaps one  $y^{\rm e}$  other,  $y^{\rm e}$  shade may hinder. Yet however that may happen,  $y^{\rm e}$  annuall course, together with  $y^{\rm e}$  tur= ning of  $y^{\rm e}$  planet (most probably to be presumed) will give all parts a su= ceSsive share of  $y^e$  better & worse. What is most fully instructive of all thats known, & I believe knowable of this planet, may be found in Mons<sup>r</sup>: Hugens's Systema Saturni, & his Cosmotheoreos.<sup>124</sup> I shall not encourage such an abySs of speculation as y<sup>e</sup> ultra Saturnian world must afford, supposing as some do that viewing from a fixt starr  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun to appear no better, or all  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm planets}\ {\rm invi=}$ sible, & that turning  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  other way, every fixt starr as a sun, & probably circumsti= pated with an order of planets, & subplanets & sic in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>124</sup> Christiaan Huyghens (1629-95) wrote a general account of cosmography, *Cosmotheoros* ..., The Hague, 1698. Although completed by Huyghens before his death, it was published posthumously. It was translated into English (from Latin) as *The Celestial Words Discovered* ..., (London, 1698) even before a Dutch translation.

## Physica (<del>271</del>) 109

& sic in infinitum. We have enough to do at home, where we inhabit our planet, & so must know y<sup>e</sup> nature & constitution of it by that & observations, are in= structed in y<sup>e</sup> constitution of our subpla= net y<sup>e</sup> moon. And being aided by y<sup>e</sup> opdi= optick means, discerne y<sup>e</sup> others, & conclude analogically y<sup>e</sup> same with /of\ them. And that y<sup>e</sup> negative fancy, if any such be, that those great bodys are not, like y<sup>e</sup> earth, inhabited, & planted, is most unreasonable.

I have here treated y<sup>e</sup> mundane scheme, not as an astronomer, to instruct that exquisite science, but as a naturallist discoursing (as it were ex paSsant)<sup>125</sup> of y<sup>e</sup> world, to inform so much of it as an or= dinary curious person may be desirous & contented to know; without insisting upon nice account & calculates, w<sup>ch</sup> cou'd not

87.
Astronomy
waived &
of y<sup>e</sup> incer=
tainty of
it

 $^{125}$  i.e., pausing briefly from that role (and not, therefore, making the observation 'en passant').

(272) Physica

not be persued without making at least a compendium of astronomy; & transcribing out of authors what every one may come at; I must own that of all  $y^{\rm e}$  sciences astronomy is  $y^{\rm e}$  most magnificent; But I have no faith in ye precise regularity of form & mea= sure;  $w^{\rm ch}$  by  $y^{\rm e}$  profeSsors are aSsigned to y<sup>e</sup> observables in y<sup>e</sup> boundleSs universe no more that n what is found in  $y^{\rm e}$  mi= nor elements, of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$   $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  whole is composed, of all  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  nothing is so securely predicated as irregularity, and it wou'd be wonderfull indeed, if rude ingredients coming toge= ther without expreSs art or design, shoud make an artfull & polite composition. It is a mean reflexion that cannot tran= scend our exillitys, but esteems immensi= tys (of  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}\ y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  least observable differences are in truth vast Hiatus's) according to our

# Physica (<del>273</del>) 110

our diminitive capacitys. Who ever in nature found any thing truly, round, square, cubick or Globular? And how comes  $y^{\text{e}}$  planetary bodys & their formes or courses to be so qualifyed, or otherwise than as common things of w<sup>ch</sup> we can on= ly say, inclining to one or other? as when we say  $y^{\text{e}}$  earth &  $y^{\text{e}}$  rest of  $y^{\text{e}}$  planets are globular, we mean in y<sup>e</sup> main on= ly, as discernable at a distance, where y<sup>e</sup> asperitys of of y<sup>e</sup> surfaces cannot ap= pear, & when we speak of orbits circu= lar or elliptick we mean inclining most to such figures, but perpetually more or leSs varying, as incident irre= gularity may intervene to influence them. Nor may this be accounted any imperfection, for all quantitys of 3 dimensions, longum, latum, & profundum^{126} are equally

(274) Physica

are equally perfect & precise dispositi= ons belong to art & not to nature.

And for this cause in these enquirys I relye upon physicall principles on= ly, w<sup>ch</sup> I am sure are universally true, & by  $y^{\rm e}$  help of these I expect, as I have be gun, to go on, & physically to resolve  $y^{\rm e}$ aeconomy of y<sup>e</sup> planets, as y<sup>e</sup> analogys of sensible things in our observation in= struct us. And it is hoped this may be warrantably done without appealing to any ascititious principles,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{ch}$  are no leSs readily denyed than demanded. As for instance,  $y^{\rm e}$  common law of attrac= tion,  $w^{\rm ch}$  supposes all bodys indued with a power to attract each other according to substance & distance. Now besides that this is not proved true by any, but to be false by many experiments of subluna/ry\ things

88 against y<sup>e</sup> philo= sophy of y<sup>e</sup> vires<sup>127</sup>

things; it is an unphilosophical way of proceeding, because it always [Leavs?]  $y^{\rm e}$ same Nescience that is designed to be removed by it. As when two things come together, it is asked why? we answer by reason of some impulse. But they sayanswer, by attraction; & what is that? a quallity or (w<sup>ch</sup> is the same thing) pow= er to inherent in a body to attract. And so of every other quallity,  $\ensuremath{\textbf{w}}^{ch}$ they are pleased to call powers; of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  there are many supposed to draw or drive body severall ways; And are but so many stopps to inquiry, without any science of naturall things; Is it not better (so farr as may be) to reduce all action & force to impulse,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  by  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  very nature of body must yeild ye effect? But this doth not what attraction pretends to, plaister every

(276) Physica

plaister every sore, as when questions are asked concerning blood, bones, nou= rishment &  $y^{\rm e}$  like? answer  $y^{\rm e}$  parts at= tract one another. And so every one that gets by heart  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  cant is a philosopher. As what question can be unanswerable, when y<sup>e</sup> particulae attractivae are ready to be called in? And in short, in all our late philoso= phicall wrightings, we are so dinned with ye word attraction, that it is be= come perfectly fastidious.  $^{\rm 128}$  As for  $y^{\rm e}$ trite answer commonly given to ob= jectors, against ye use of these pre= carious powers in [pholosophising?], that most phaenomena are not resolvable without them. I answer, nor any tru= ly with them, as was noted, in y<sup>e</sup> fore= going discourse of indistinguishables, such as may be gueSsed, but cannot be known And who

<sup>128</sup> This is one of the many dark, punning jokes available to readers: for someone with school Latin, 'fastidious' means the opposite of attractive, so attraction has become repulsive.

And who set us a Cock-horse to know every thing? that we may & do know something of  $y^{e}$  world is true; but that we can, or do know everything is false. And want of science, is no scandall; but to pretend it, where in truth there is none, is deceipt= full. And if that is found in any philo= sophicall sect, it is where, in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  room of causes, quallitys or vires, and are held forth, & so there may be found as many kind of quallitys, as of querys. But to finish at once  $y^e$  question of attraction,  $\text{acc}_{\Theta T}/\text{or} \$ as it is stated of every thing, if we per= sist in in y<sup>e</sup> opinion of universall ple= nitude, it vanisheth, for in fullneSs all drawing & none drawing, is y<sup>e</sup> same thing. And it was partly for that thing ye cosmicall vacuity was set up, for with= out that,  $y^{\rm e}$  whole hypothesis in many respe/cts  $\$ failed

(278) Physica

failed. I know there are many experiments from  $w^{\rm ch},$  vacuity, density, & rarity of so= lids are said to be inferred, but untill y<sup>e</sup> elementary composition of things can be exposed, none of these inferences will lay hold of any aSsent to principles, that have but a presumptive existence. And many for shelter alledge that they are not bound to give any reasons for ye vires; it's enough that there are such, & thro them as, from phaenomena to come to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ generall cause, true; for principles are to be argued, but discovered, as. body im= penetrable, is a principle known to be u= niversally & without exception true, & none asks a reason for it. And when attraction comes with that character we will subscribe, and not demand any reasons.

It may be expected here that having laid down

89. The plane= tary scheme proposed as to y<sup>e</sup> causes of it

## Physica (<del>279</del>) 113

down  $y^{\text{e}}$  scheme of  $y^{\text{e}}$  planetary world, I should proceed to give some physicall ac= count of  $y^{\rm e}$  severall revolves &  $y^{\rm e}$  medium in  $w^{ch}$  they are made, as  $y^{e}$  late grandees in philosophy have attempted. But fore= seeing that this will draw on a compa= rison of y<sup>e</sup> two late famous hypotheses of  $y^{\rm e}$  heavens,  $y^{\rm e}$  one of attraction in va= cuo, & y<sup>e</sup> other of common motion in ple= no; And that besides  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  comparative magnitudes & courses of  $y^{\rm e}$  planets  $w^{\rm ch}$  $y^{e} \mbox{ late /optick} \mbox{ discoverys have cleared, nothing }$ further of y<sup>e</sup> whole subject is or can be conjectured but (as I hinted from analogy, & those respecting  $\underline{\mathsf{of}} \mathrm{our}$  common notices of things objects about us,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  may be nearly observed & experimented; I have thought fitt to postpone  $y^e$  physicall resolution of  $y^{\text{e}}$  solar system a short space, & here directly fall upon y<sup>e</sup> principall terres= trian phaenomena, & to resolve them as farr as

(280) Physica

farr as by y<sup>e</sup> means of our sensitive fa= cultys & reasonable imaginations may be warranted & in that course beginn with fluidity.

Of y<sup>e</sup> Air & Hemisphear.

90. of fluidi= ty

The difference between ye states of solid & fluid bodys, is obviously perceived, being only that y<sup>e</sup> former consists of parts res= ting in continuo,  $^{129}$  & y<sup>e</sup> other of parts al= way in agitation, as hath been already noted. And to this I add that all ye mat= ter of  $y^{\text{e}}$  world, is either fluid, or by  $y^{\text{e}}$ operation of fire may be fluidized. And in generall it is to be affirmed, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter of fluids agitated. And in generall it is to be affirmed, that ye matter of fluids agitated, is more subtile than even imagination can reach, 130 therefore ye Idea of it is confused, that is indistinct, & no poSsible means can discover  $y^e$  texture, & minute

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 129}$  i.e., 'staying in the same place with regard to each other'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>130</sup> There are numerous repetitions of words and phrases in the MS; some have been identified in the process of writing and corrected by MN, some have been struck out by the editorial graphite pencil, some have been missed, as here - the rest are the fruit of my incompetence.

action of any fluid. And it is to be re= membred that celeritys properly belong to small things, & motions discernable unto greater, & we must not carry our notions of palpable objects, &  $y^{\rm e}$  distinct effects of force, referring to our practises, by mentall comparison down into ye re= gions of minuteneSs; for y<sup>e</sup> phaenomena will be very different, as no artfull means whatever can by application to bodys distinguishable, produce an effect paralell with fluidity. but excepting  $y^e$  single effects of impulses  $w^{ch}$  are alike in all instances of great & small what= soever; there is in fluidity an intertex= ture of y<sup>e</sup> motive effects <del>of</del> in per, & trans<sup>131</sup> all manner of ways, whereby every part is influenced by every part, & in all directions promiscuously,  $w^{\rm ch}$ produceth various effects in common,

& is y<sup>e</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>131</sup> i.e., 'in, by and through'.

(282)

#### Physica

& is  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  foundation of a peculiar science of fluids preSsing or gravitating, of w<sup>ch</sup> Archimedes hath left us a tract,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is like Euclids elements to y<sup>e</sup> matters of hy= drostaticks, 132 & (presuming upon a liberty of repeating a little of what hath past) of them let us borrow but one image, w<sup>ch</sup> is a tun of water with a foramen at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$ bottom, whence iSsues a current with a force as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  perpendicular height of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ inferior water requires. Now every part within, by  $y^{\rm e}$  influences of its impulses, contributes to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water iSsuing, but in no sort directly, but consequently, being conducted thro innumerable ambages, therefore by way of summ y<sup>e</sup> mecha= nicks etsteem  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  common influence to paSs by strait lines from every part to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  foramen. As by means of gravity all parts of a fluid have a tendency one way

 $<sup>^{132}</sup>$  i.e., Archimedes' De insidentibus humido (i.e., 'On floating bodies'), and Euclid's Elements; both texts date from c. 300 BCE.

way, but under confinement or preSsure, there will be a direction of y<sup>e</sup> forces by strait lines every way, in y<sup>e</sup> least yielding, as may be afterwards obser= ved, & partly already explained.

As to those collections of matter w<sup>ch</sup> compose our common fluids, as water, oyle, Mercury, spirits, &c. their compo= nent parts must be (in all respects some fluidity only) looked upon as solids, he= terogene, & consisting of a consimilar matter up<del>on</del>/on\ mutuall touch apt to combine; but how, and wherein y<sup>e</sup> diffe= rences consist, neither y<sup>e</sup> exterior phae= nomena, nor interior conjecture will inlighten, but all such matters must be ablegated to y<sup>e</sup> regions of y<sup>e</sup> in= cognoscibillia.<sup>133</sup> But in one respect both fluids & solids have a common capacity, w<sup>ch</sup> is to be permeable to some

parts

91.
porositys
& intersti=
ces ad in=
finitum

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>133</sup> i.e., (!) 'unknowable'.

(284) Physica

parts of  $y^{\text{e}}$  universall fluidity,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  I have called  $y^{\rm e}$  interstitiall, & may add  $y^{\rm e}$  subinterstitiall matter & so on ad infinitum. And it may be made a ques= tion whither there is an intire part of matter in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world, not porous or wholly impermeable, by some other (more mi= nutlely) interstitiall matter. We are sure we have no experiment of any com= pound so quallifyed, wittneSs  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  transit of odors,  $y^{\rm e}$  magnetick operations, &  $y^{\rm e}$ effects of fire. According to this scheme I shall presume that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  generall mat= ter of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole world, consisting of difforme & unequall parts is (quasi) one universall fluid, of  $w^{\rm ch}$  each part hath an influentiall communication with all  $y^e$  rest, as water in a veSsell within its limits hath. And as to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  extent of influences, none can say that they are not as

## Physica (<del>285</del>) 116

not as matter it self is infinite, for en= titys comparative do not determine in any degree of exility. This boundleSs fluid is, not y<sup>e</sup> leSs intirely one, for having some solids, as y<sup>e</sup> planets, casually natant in it; so a pool of water, or y<sup>e</sup> sea is one, tho some spongeous substances grow up or swim in it. And upon this method of imagination I have founded y<sup>e</sup> notion of actuall infinity of minuteneSs in all y<sup>e</sup> world, of w<sup>ch</sup> further use will be made, when we come to deal with ex= plosions, & some other Crypta of nature.

93, Of water & air only

I intend here to have no more to do with any kind of fluids saving only air & water. The rest are of so many sorts, & have such variety of effects, that nothing singularly can be affirmed concerning y<sup>e</sup> composition of them. The vertuosi,

especially

### (286) Physica

Especially chymists may afford us some naturall history of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  symptomes, but nothing phisycall concerning them, as to in= stance, what is  $y^e$  reall difference, between Mercury, Rectifyed spirityss, oyle & fair water, about  $w^{\rm ch}$  matters  $y^{\rm e}$  philosophers have a ready cant of attraction, & I know not what, but nothing substan= tiall or satisfactory? And we living perpetually, as it were, in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}\xspace$  midst of air, & water, can observe & know more of them than of all other fluids in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ world; And if we can make any disco= very out of these, there is a liberty by analogy, or otherwise a may be thought fitt, to apply them to other instances of fluidity.

Speaking of air we mean not in a sence universall, but that w<sup>ch</sup> we breath, & by pneumatick

Of y<sup>e</sup> Atmos phear & elastici= ty

pneumatick experiements is found to envelope  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  globe we live upon, with a thickneSs of about 50 miles high e= very where more or leSs compreSst, & called  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  atmosphear, And that it is further compreSsible, or may be con= tracted by cold, or by any force artifi= cially applyed, whereby it will seem to take up leSs room than before. And on y<sup>e</sup> other side by relieving y<sup>e</sup> preSsure or applying heat, it will reexpand, & being in such cases [....?] confined, it will al= ways (in appearance) crowd to gain more room. And  $y^e$  body of it being of it self ponderous, there succeeds a con= tinuall preSsure of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  superiour parts upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  inferior,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole tending always to expand with a force dimi= nishing upwards, in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  proportion (as  $\boldsymbol{I}$ take it)

(288) Physica

take it) of squares, And that every solid immerst in it, as well as  $y^{\rm e}$  earths sur= face, bears  $y^{\rm e}$  force of this expansion, according as it is placed higher or lower in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  perpendicular. And this is called  $y^{\text{e}}$  spring or  $y^{\text{e}}$  elasticity of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air; And whatever is y<sup>e</sup> cause of this tendency to expand, is by analogy y<sup>e</sup> cause of all springyneSs (even in solids) as will be shewed, therefore  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  word elasticity, is very properly applyed to signify all such tendencys of what kind or man= er soever. I must here observe that what we understand by  $y^{\rm e}$  words ra= refaction & condensation belongs wholly to air &  $y^{\rm e}$  interstitialls of one sort or other, & to no other substance what= soever. I account not  $y^{\text{e}}$  expansion & contraction of oyls & spirits among these, The

94. Of water becoming air Physica

(<del>289</del>) 118

The severall diSsipations of matter effected by force, or fire, have other de= nominations, as explosions, consumings, & y<sup>e</sup> like, w<sup>ch</sup> will have their places.

Now y<sup>e</sup> case of common water is to be considered, & first that (directly) it is neither condensible, nor extendible; for taking a quantity apart, no force will either compreSs, or make it swell, so as to require more or leSs space. This shews  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts obdurate, but what porositys may be, nothing can discover, no more than what are  $y^{\rm e}$  forms or com= parative magnitudes of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts. It is found that water will seem to decay, or dry up; And that heat is  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  cause of it; I am not yet ready to persue y<sup>e</sup> ex= tream effects of fire, but at present attend only to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  manner of this wasting of humidity; w<sup>ch</sup> every degree of heat

more or

(290) Physica

more or leSs produceth. And in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  main I must affirm, that all substance  $w^{\rm ch}$  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water departs from, its maSs will be found in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  air. It is certain that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  preSsure of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  watery surface is very great, & those conterminous superficies being on either side (however they appear to us) rugged & interfering, & y<sup>e</sup> superfi= ciall parts also in continuall agita= tion, those of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water are struck or fly into  $y^{\rm e}$  air, & there aSsimilate & are as it were lost. This operation may be visible to  $y^{\rm e}$  eye for if  $y^{\rm e}$ water is set over a fire to warm,  $y^{\rm e}$ waving of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  surface of  $y^{\text{e}}$ water apparently licks  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  steams from it, & this  $y^{\rm e}$  learned call vapour, & suppose it to exist in its proper form heterogeneous to  $y^{\rm e}$  air, & upon contin= gent causes, to return to water again.

But I

119r

#### Physica (<del>291</del>) 119

But I must suppose that this steam be= comes perfect air as any we breath, & (as I take it) water will be found y<sup>e</sup> chief ingredient in y<sup>e</sup> air. But that it is such from y<sup>e</sup> moment of its parting, is demonstrated by y<sup>e</sup> Aeolipile, byut more eminently by ye pneumatick fire-engine.  $^{134}$  For, (there)  $y^{\rm e}$  steam of a copper, is directed into a braSs veSsell (allmost) full of water & makes room for it self by crowding y<sup>e</sup> water out by a conduct to a vent at any height required. And then ye steams filling  $y^{\rm e}$  voided veSsell, is as perfect air with all its propertys. Especially ye constant quallity of elasticity, as any air we breath; as for this air returning back to water, I shall observe it afterwards. In y<sup>e</sup> mean time, I cannot Joyn with

those

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>134</sup> An aeolipile (literally 'wind-ball' in Greek) is a steam-driven engine described first by Vitruvius (c.75-15 BCE). Water was heated in a vessel suspended on a spindle sealed except for two jets; when steam formed its escape would would cause the ball to spin. The 'Fire Engine' was patented in 1698 by Thomas Savery (1650-1715). Water heated in a closed vessel was allowed to escape as steam, this created a partial vacuum which, by the manipulation of taps, allowed water to be drawn into the vessel which could, in its turn, be heated and released - allowing more water to be drawn in. The Fire Engine was designed for the draining of mines. Savery's engine was demonstrated to the Royal Society in 1699 (*see* the *Phil. Trans.* 1 January 1699 vol. 21 no. 248-259 (http:// rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/ 21/248-259/228.full.pdf+html). Savery's Fire Engine inaugurated the mechanical application of Boyle's law for productive purposes. *See* also BL Add MS 32545, note on fol. 316r.

Atmos= phear, or air is but water e= vaporated & of va pours

{\_}}

(292) Physica

those that distinguish vapour from air, & fancy that air consists of globules hollow, & filled with vacuity w<sup>ch</sup> gives way to compreSsure, & by a vis elastica,<sup>135</sup> of y<sup>e</sup> materiall of y<sup>e</sup> globules, dilate again. Of all w<sup>ch</sup>, so much as signifys any thing is begging, w<sup>ch</sup> allways returns upon them. But philosophick presump= tion, or rather ignorance will always deal precariously, & never advance science.

But now we are to remark in generall, that y<sup>e</sup> surface of the earths globe is most sheer water, & much of y<sup>e</sup> rest humid, & scarce any part absolutely dry; And all apt {(}with a moderate warmth, {)} to part with their moisture, whereby if there were no atmosphear at all y<sup>e</sup> suns heat wou'd soon, from y<sup>e</sup> humiditys of y<sup>e</sup> earth, raise one. And then then  $y^{\rm e}$  whole body of  $y^{\rm e}$  air wou'd con= sist of meer water evapourated. But as it is, supposing that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  atmosphear (what ever y<sup>e</sup> substance of it is) hath been originally raised (& is continued) by  $y^{\text{e}}$  vertue of heat, from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earths surface; It is cer= tain that great part consists of matter adust, & untill received into ye body of ye air, not properly fluid; but of that kind,  $w^{ch}$  by strong culinary fires is rai= sed in smoak, &  $y^{\rm e}$  groaSs substances, as wood &c are discerped & dispersed, & only an ashy [fecae?]<sup>136</sup> left. But still, all cir= cumstances considered, there is so little of this, compared with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  steams from moisture, that, denominando a majori, 137 I may inferr that ye Atmosphear con= sists of evapourated water. I know that it is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>136</sup> i.e., feces, waste.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 137}$  i.e., 'in large part, the most of it'.

(294) Physica

{or heterogen}

it is a mode at present,, to reject this notion, & to give  $y^e$  air a specifi $\{\underline{ck}_{-}\}$  body,  $w^{ch}$  is to serve as a vehicle for  $y^e$  watery parts raised by heat, & to bear them a= bout till causes intervene to return them to water again; & hence is formed a science of vapours; sometimes they are high, & sometimes low, then heavy, now light. And serving here & there in ye composition of unusuall phaenome= na, as if they were Jupiters militia in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  government of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air. And nothing meteorall can be spoke of or proposed, but strait regiments of vapours are raised for  $y^{\rm e}$  service, & in all those in= stances, as y<sup>e</sup> Aurorae Boreales, par= heliae, Halos, Hurricans &c, y<sup>e</sup> unknown trade of vapours is so inculcated, as to become a fierce insult upon pati=/ence, being

## Physica (<del>295</del>) 121

being for y<sup>e</sup> most part ignotum per ig= notius;<sup>138</sup> And some being enamoured on new principles, y<sup>e</sup> air is adopted for one, tho containing nothing but what is common to y<sup>e</sup> terraqueous globe: The atmosphear, considering y<sup>e</sup> magnitude of its basis, can be no strange thing; since it is thought every animall, & even plants & seeds have their proper effluvia, w<sup>ch</sup> to them are in y<sup>e</sup> state (gravitation excepted) as our atmosphear is to y<sup>e</sup> earth.

96. circulati<del>on</del>/on\ of air waters

But to take a larger view of y<sup>e</sup> course of air & waters, some have estimated that y<sup>e</sup> sun draws up from y<sup>e</sup> medi= terranean sea, more waters, than all y<sup>e</sup> rivers that run into it, & rains to boot can supply; & for that reason it always runns in at y<sup>e</sup> fretums.<sup>139</sup> What then is raised from y<sup>e</sup> oceans? Enough one

wou'd

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>138</sup> i.e., 'unknown to the ignorant'. RN could be included in that regiment of vapourous theorisers, see BL Add MS 32546, fols 124r-140r.

{\_}}

97. Water drawn from air by cold (296) Physica

wou'd think that without a restitu= tion, shou'd dry up ye seas, & make ye Atmosphear, as it were, run over. This grand exhaustion is made in y<sup>e</sup> tropick regions, &  $y^{\rm e}$  restitution about  $y^{\rm e}$  articks, where in rain, snow's, & Dews, {<u>almost</u>} continuall & great increase of waters is made, w<sup>ch</sup> devolve in rivers & currents to recruit ye ocean; so that upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  face of the earth, between  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ polar & &  $y^{\rm e}$  equinictiall regions, there is a perpetuall circulation of air, & wa= ters, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  atmosphear settles towards  $y^{\rm e}$  poles, &  $y^{\rm e}$  seas by various unaccoun= table currents from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  poles towards y<sup>e</sup> equator, & so make a ballance of rotundity of ye whole.

We see how water comes to be sub= limed into air, it is next to be exa= mined how y<sup>e</sup> restitution is made by y<sup>e</sup> precipitation

#### (<del>297</del>) 122 Physica

precipitation of air into water, & that seems to be done by a reverst proceSs. For as heat raised ye water into air, so cold letts it fall again; for it is never known that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  quallitys of heat & cold meet in or about  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air, but betwixt them moisture is generated; all ye humid meteors, as clouds, mists & rain, so also all our practiq dis= tillations, depend upon this Crisis, when it rains,  $y^{\text{e}}$  drops fall, as from a still. There is not such a thing as a cool place dry, & even  $y^e$  springs of water, especially from rocky & cavernous hills, are perennall by  $y^{e}$  same m{eans. Th}ere are some that pretend to defecate air from all humidable matter. It is hard to pronounce a certainty, in sny such experiment, for who can tell when y<sup>e</sup> air is perfectly defecate? and

{<u>as will be</u> shewed}

what

(298)

what of that kind is done is by means of cold, & y<sup>e</sup> power of that is limited, & cannot be, as fire, carryed to any great extremity. But thus farr seems true, that air immediately raised falls back into water, quicker than after it hath been long intermixt with ye com= mon air. this appears by  $y^{\rm e}$  fire engine, where y<sup>e</sup> hot vapour, w<sup>ch</sup> aSsuredly is nothing but a steam of water is im= mediately cooled into humidity, but where such artful circumstances do not meet,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e} \text{ proceSs}$  is slower. And poSsibly, when a hot new raised steam is diSsipated in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts may divide & perhaps clasp with adust particles, & acquire a degree of siccity, as when water is put upon lime, it petrifys & perhaps never returns to water again But as to y<sup>e</sup> effects of cold producing humidity

Physica

Physica (

humidity,  $y^{\rm e}$   $% y^{\rm e}$  experiments are so constant & universall, as leave no doubt of  $y^{\rm e}$ manner of  $y^e$  operation, that is, by im= peding y<sup>e</sup> agitation of y<sup>e</sup> parts, w<sup>ch</sup> permitts them (that by motion were kept as under) to coalesce, & so to ap= pear in dropps. Cool wine /in a\ glaSs, A coach glaSs after  $y^{\rm e}$  sun hath shined upon  $y^{\rm e}$ door; an empty glaSs bottle in a win= dow where  $y^{\rm e}$  sun comes, & infinite other instances shew this effect; & y<sup>e</sup> saying that vapours are in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air in all these places, is a chiccane, that can never be answered. To confirm all: humidity in  $y^{\text{e}}$  air prevails in ye conterminations of hot & cold, as between summer & winter, between ye warm soil, & ye middle region, where clouds are generated, between North & south winds interfering, between night & day

(300) Physica (2300)

& day, & between y<sup>e</sup> hot climates & y<sup>e</sup> cold; so that when ever y<sup>e</sup> contrarietys appear, either naturally, or by means of art, y<sup>e</sup> air is never wanting to cor= respond in moisture.

Of all our obvious phaenomena, None is so misterious, as that of rarefaction & condensation; y<sup>e</sup> principles of Carte= sius led him neerer to a solution than any have come either before or since. for his making body impenetrable, & y<sup>e</sup> like of extension or space, did not consist with any compreSsure, or dila= tion of y<sup>e</sup> same matter; but made y<sup>e</sup> ceSsion & acceSsion of parts to be a ne= ceSsary resolution. But when he con= discended to aSsign praecise forms, & flexibillity to his watery parts, he exceeded y<sup>e</sup> power of human sense, & also contradicted himself; for if parts

may not

98. Of rare= faction & conden= sation

#### Physica (<del>301</del>) 124

may not be compreSsed, how shou'd they bend? The latter philosophers are so gone with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  doctrine of powers, as to resolve every thing by them, so here y<sup>e</sup> account they give, (as I think was hinted before) is that rarefactio est partium ses mutuo fugi= entium, & condensatio est partium sese mutuo appetentium.<sup>140</sup> If this was intended a definition only, it is very ill worded, for it assigns living quallitys toof detes= tation & appetition to inanimato matter: but finding no other resolution from them we must take this for one, or at least for a figurate description only. Ast to one thing both agree,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is that matter is not compreSsible, not exten= dible so as to make more leSs, & leSs more. But y<sup>e</sup> former supposeth only an ex= clusion, & acceSsion of matter in  $y^e$  opera/tions  $\$ to make

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>140</sup> i.e., 'rarefaction is the mutual flight of parts, condensation their mutually approaching each other'; I have not traced this as a quotation, it is possibly paraphrased freely from Newton's *Principia*.

(30<del>1</del>2) Physica

to make room & withall to conserve plenitude; according to y<sup>e</sup> occasion. but y<sup>e</sup> latter are so fond of vacuity, as to make that serve either way. First to make ye room for condensing, & then as for rarefying,  $y^{\rm e}$ intersperst vacuitys are to be encreased; but this is hard to be conceived, considering how matter about us is ever crowded, suf= ficient to keep it close enough together. But I believe that upon this notion of intersperst vacuity,  $y^{\rm e}$  fancy of dense & rare is founded; And they seem to make those to be different characters of body, rather as specificke principles, than as consequences of operation. Density & rarity supposing them to be no other= wise conceived are confused Ideas; but there is an usefull latitude by arbitra= ry degrees or plus & minus of them  $w^{\rm ch}$ 

some
(<del>3023</del>) 125

some make use of in their method to re= concile divers hard cases; but no more of these.

Now since we have not facultys to inspect these operations, by means of any but con= fused experiments; we must follow them a well as we may by conjectures; & that according to analogy with known things, whereby to discover (if not clear & dis= tinct truths yet) fair probabillitys. It is certain that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole phaenomenon of rarefaction & condensation depends upon confinement, without  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  we should discerne or know nothing of it; & what we do know is by veSsells of common materiall, as wood, leather, earth, glaSs, &c.  $w^{\rm ch}$  being filled with  $y^{\rm e}$  materiall we call air, are impervious to some part of it, & to other part are meer sives, like our basketts that {that} let water or sand

99. Both de= pend on confine= ment

{\_}}

125r

(<del>2</del>30<del>3</del>4) Physica

sand paSs freely, but retain all manner of grain. Let a blown bladder be of that sort, & held in its state under a cont= nuall distention or compreSsure. If ye sides became as a spunge or wool, pervious to y<sup>e</sup> whole materiall contai= ned, they woud soon come together; but since they yield to compreSsure but in some degree, & that enforced, it appears that of y<sup>e</sup> whole content, only some part is extruded, & y<sup>e</sup> rest remains, & thus farr upon account of impenetra= billity is true. But what is it that holds  $y^{\rm e}$  bladder extended, & that but to a certain degree, thereby resisting  $y^{\rm e}$  out= ward compreSsure, w<sup>ch</sup> being removed, an expansion results accordingly? I answer that it must be  $y^{\text{e}}$  force of  $y^{\text{e}}$  interior parts,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  by fluidizing activity of  $y^e$ whole strike against  $y^e$  sides of  $y^e$  bladder; & it is

### Physica

(<del>3045</del>)126

And it is not enough to reply that such strokes are pusille & weak, for number always makes an equivalent to measure. But then what susteins this impelling force in  $y^{\text{e}}$  air,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  being included & preSst, one woud gueSs shoud likeas other agencys in like circumstances, sink by degrees & come to nothing? I must answer that it is not only y<sup>e</sup> impulse of y<sup>e</sup> matter in= closed, that of it self works this effect, but of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  exterior matter of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world (for I know not where to confine it) that from all regions round about, by means of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ interstitiall matter acts upon  $y^{\rm e}$  subtile matter within, & that upon  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm groSser}$ air, & that upon ye sides of ye bladder, & so by a series of activity from abroad  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  expansion is invigorated. Here is a fund of force sufficient, if duly applyed /collected\, & employed to blow up a mountain & is

termed

(30<del>5</del>6) Physica

termed rarefaction, & so with ordinary means to stand against a common com= preSsure.

But ye matter is yet not a little dark, for one cannot well imagine that when y<sup>e</sup> included air is [....?]compreSst into a small compaSs, y<sup>e</sup> parts shou'd not cling toge= ther & take a form more quiescent as of dust or water. I answer that it doth so, but in time; for nothing can on a sudden drive such an effect against  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of all parts abroad, so as to make an extream condensation all at once, but gradually  $y^{\rm e}$  strength of a compreSsure wasts; As a bladder blown turgid will become flaccid, a wind gun charged & let stand, will contrasct a moisture, & loose its force. We have many instances of things that being o= ver violently urged will burst; & so it is when

100. The force of compreSsure gradually wasts

## Physica (<del>3056</del>) 127

when a compreSsure is over exasperated, as lett a man jump upon a bladder,  $y^{\rm e}$  sides will burts rather than on a sud= den yeild to extremity. **f**For y<sup>e</sup> action is opposed by  $y^{\rm e}$  exterior matter, & in such greater extent as y<sup>e</sup> force is more ra= pid. Now that cold ha& warmth have ye same effects upon inclosed matter, as compreSsure & relaxation have, will be allowed, when it is considered, that heat by agitation increasing  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  interior force, produceth more distension, & cold abating  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  action, is equivalent to compreSsure. And how farr these causes may be aug mented so as to produce very violent effects, may be considered afterwards. In  $y^e$  mean time  $y^e$  question must be an= swered, how it happens that these effects shou'd be  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  same in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  open air, where (it may be said) there is no such inclosure as I have

(3078) Physica.

as I have all along supposed, & it is done by shewing, that y<sup>e</sup> weight of y<sup>e</sup> air in tanto<sup>141</sup> makes an inclosure; for as hath been observed, that holds y<sup>e</sup> air itself under a stated compreSsure, according to altitude in y<sup>e</sup> perpendicular.

I mentioned common elasticity, supposing it resolvable upon y<sup>e</sup> like principles of rarefaction, & now y<sup>e</sup> busineSs is to make good y<sup>e</sup> paralell. And I must first pre= caution that in this discourse I shall referr only to bodys that being deflec= ted shall result, & vibrate, & not to cases of impulse, as when one hard bo= dy is forced against another, it is sayd to reflect. For that is not spring but an instantaneous separation, & ad= mitts no degrees; there is often a com= mixture, as when a pellet of marble is dropt upon a marble floor, both cau/ses\

may

101. Of elasti= city distinct from im= pulsory se= paration

# Physica (<del>309</del>) 128

may operate, as hardneSs chiefly & spring partly, whereof y<sup>e</sup> effect is confused, & not wholly derived of either; & y<sup>e</sup> computation can scarce be made, for soft bodys re= flect most by spring, as Tennis-balls, that are made of hair, & y<sup>e</sup> obdurate, most by mechanick law, as Marbles. For even those are not without some spring. But y<sup>e</sup> mediall resistance considered, y<sup>e</sup> most perfect resilition, or neerest to y<sup>e</sup> force of y<sup>e</sup> acceSs, is y<sup>e</sup> adamantine.

102
Contraction/on\
of cavitys
y<sup>e</sup> cause
of springs

But to avoid these suspicions of a difference, I shall as I said take a pure vibrating spring, such as y<sup>e</sup> lath of a croSs bow, un= nealed wire, or y<sup>e</sup> like, be it of wood, glaSs, or any compound w<sup>ch</sup> will result & vibrate. In these there are cavitys of all forms, & most frequent, so that one may re= pute them intirely either vascular, or ca=/vernous\ & however

(310) Physica

& however Microscopes may shew it in some measure, especially in wood, there is reason to presume much more. These cavitys contain air, or else a fluid, mat= ter finer than air, but yet distinguisht into more or leSs fine;  $y^{\text{e}}$  latter of  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is enclosed, & cannot paSs; y<sup>e</sup> other may paSs, & communicate with ye externall fluids, & receives activity from them. Now when any of these bodys are bent,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  cavitys are contracted, &  $y^{\rm e}$  spring of  $y^{\rm e}$  included matter operates to reinforce  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  former capacity, as so many bladders of air compreSst; But  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  most elastick of any are those bodys  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  consist of tubes, or whose cavitys runn out at length; & such are all vegeta= tion, & bodys formed by a proceSs of exten= ding, as wire. And some have their ex= terior superficies closed, as harden'd mettalls watchPhysica.

(<del>311</del>)

watch-springs, & some others, as if a single hair be paSsed against a thumb nail, it becomes more springy, & curles up. Sometimes meer hammer hardening will cause e= lasticity, & in all those cases, ye loosening ye parts of ye body by fire, w<sup>ch</sup> opens ye cavi= tys, & is called nealing (ye practise of silversmiths) disables ye spring, w<sup>ch</sup> by hamme= ring again is restored.

But y<sup>e</sup> most wonderfull of all springs is y<sup>e</sup> glaSs dropps; those hot from y<sup>e</sup> furnace are dropt in cold water, & such as do not burst have a wonderfull hardneSs, & if y<sup>e</sup> tails be deflected to a fracture, w<sup>ch</sup> is not easily done, y<sup>e</sup> crack runns through y<sup>e</sup> whole substance, & y<sup>e</sup> included sprin= gy fluid works in diSsipating all y<sup>e</sup> ma= teriall in dust, as an explosion. And if y<sup>e</sup> tail be put in a candle, so much of it as takes an heat broke off without

any such

103. The state of glaSs dropps

### (312) Physica

any such consequence. For that opens  $y^{\rm e}$  cavitys, so as  $y^{\rm e}$  included matter may vent, while  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  unnealed part is left as it was constringed by sudden applications /of  $y^e$  extreams of  $\$  of heat & cold at  $y^e$  superficies to a great closeneSs without discharge. It is commonly observable, that glaSs from a point where ye force is applyed, cracks as y<sup>e</sup> grain leads. Now in a drop y<sup>e</sup> grain is not linear but quaquaversum, direc= ted every way, & runns per & trans thro'  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole maSs all at time, so as every point is a center or concourse of springy effects, & so blows like a [....?]  $\mathtt{spr}\{\underline{\mathtt{ing}}\}$  . This seems to verifie  $y^e$  analogy between elasticity & rarefaction. If ye exility of force in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  particulars is objected, I answer as before, that num= ber is equivalent to quantity. And it will be found in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  course of nature,

that y<sup>e</sup>

{\_}

Physica (<del>313</del>) 130

that y<sup>e</sup> greatest & most wonderfull effects are produced by y<sup>e</sup> cooperation of most minute & indistinguishable materialls, & in that respect such may justly be styled element.

#### Common Cosmography.

I shoud now undertake those two vulgar (its true) but stupendious phaenomena of light, & fire, but I find that y<sup>e</sup> so= lution of them will depend so much upon y<sup>e</sup> aeconomy of y<sup>e</sup> world at large, that I think it best to deal with that first, whereby its hoped we may gather also a tolerable solution of gravita= tion, & then I think little will remain of physicall science, to be looked after & all y<sup>e</sup> rest that may be styled natu= rall philosophy, will become pure na= turall history. To proceed therefore, y<sup>e</sup>

modern

104 The New= tonian system of y<sup>e</sup> heavens

(314) Physica

modern rationale of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  heavens supposeth first  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole aetheriall space to be pure & pute vacuity, 142 wherein no manner of impediment or resistance is given to any thing that moves to & fro' in it. 2. that  $y^{\rm e}$  sun is a body of light & fire, w<sup>ch</sup> holds its place immoveable 3. That  $y^e$  planets are like  $y^e$  earth solid lumps that move about ye sun in orbits as hath been declared, & that these receiving  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ light of y<sup>e</sup> sun reflect it every way, & thereby we discern their aspects, & movements. 4. That these bodys being once originally placed & put in mo= tion (for all things that change are thought to have had a beginning) by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  law that all things will continue their state till till something causeth an alteration; will move to eternity by strait lines, unleSs diverted by some cause

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>142</sup> i.e., 'pure and unmixed'.

(105) y<sup>e</sup> postu= lata on w<sup>ch</sup> it is founded

# Physica (3<del>015</del>) 131

cause. And that there was  $\ensuremath{\&}$  is a sufficient cause to divert ye rectilinear courses, & de= tain  $y^{\rm e}$  planets in  $y^{\rm e}$  present order & cir= cuition, & so to continue indefinitely. All  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is pretended to be mathemati= cally demonstrated; & in order to that It is postulated that all bodys in y<sup>e</sup> world great and small, farr and neer, are indued with a power of mutuall attrac= tion ad modum densitatis & distantiae,  $^{\rm 143}$  where= by all have a tendency accordingly to move, and wou'd come together, if there were not sufficient causes that operate to impede them; And that wou'd be  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  case of  $y^{\text{e}}$  planets  $w^{\text{ch}}$  tend to run all,together and into y<sup>e</sup> sun, of w<sup>ch</sup> as being much y<sup>e</sup> greatest body, y<sup>e</sup> attraction is strongest; & this attractive power of  $y^{\rm e}$  sun is ter= med centripetall, & operates upon all ye planets. Now that wch staves off this consequence

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 143}$  i.e., 'in proportion to their density and distance'.

(316)

### Physica

consequence, is another power  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  draws another way, & that is  $y^{\rm e}$  motion in direc= tum,  $^{144}$  for all motion not influenced otherwise will be in directum,  $w^{\rm ch}$  (as they say) in all gyrations, will be a tan gent to  $y^{\text{e}}$  orb. But as to  $y^{\text{e}}$  planets  $y^{\text{e}}$  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  centripetall power of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun checks this direct course, & perpetually ben= ding, it somewhat to sunward, y<sup>e</sup> orbit's must prove  $\ensuremath{\mbox{Elliptick}}$  with  $y^e$  sun in ye focall point. So all ye courses are compound of two motions, ye direct & centripetall; But all this wou'd little agree with ye phaenomena of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  heavens, because of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  anomala, or very great deviations from this order,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  marks  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  calculations of  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$ planetary aspects very troublesome, & not to be made out without great allowances. And for that reason all

those

Physica (<del>317</del>) 132

those irregularitys are changed upon col= laterall attractions of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planets among themselves,  $\ensuremath{\ensuremath{\&}}$  those are accounted for by bringing y<sup>e</sup> distances & solidity of y<sup>e</sup> pla= netary bodies to a due estimate, adjusted by astronomicall observations, & judicious conclusions; & these furnish such data as help out  $y^{\text{e}}$  predictions, & enable  $y^{\text{e}}$  demon= strations. And upon these schemes,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  science & practice of modern astronomy are re= lyed; & in good truth there is a wonder= full congruity between them, &  $y^{\rm e}$  course of y<sup>e</sup> heavens, so that if truth needed no other witneSs than congruity, this hy= pothesis might paSs for demonstration in earnest. But some philosophers have held that diverse hypotheses may con= gruere,<sup>145</sup> but there can be but one truth. And if any be accepted upon that account, it must

106. Diverse fatall ob= jections to it (38) Physica

it must be founded, not upon concinnitys, but upon reall & undenyable principles.

Now to this hypothesis, not withstanding  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ great Eclat & generall acceptance of it, there may be some objections made. As first, that if y<sup>e</sup> universall vacuity be, (as it is) positively denyed, down falls ye fa= brick; And if it is said that congruity proves, it, then  $y^{\text{e}}$  truth &  $y^{\text{e}}$  congruity prove one an/d\other,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is no proof at all; & if its said  $y^{\rm e}$  courses of  $y^{\rm e}$  planets are impoSsible & cannot continue without it, that will be seen afterwards. Next, ye universall attraction is precarious,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  proofs by experiment are against it. For (mag= neticks & Electricks excepted) no 2 bodys can be (directly) so placed /in a levell\ as to come to= gether. If 2 millstones or large Gra= nado shells are suspended at long radius's, they

they will rest tantum  ${\rm non}^{146}$  touching. If they say that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  attraction of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  earth overcomes all other attractions, I answer, that operates only in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  perpendicular, & not laterally, & so neer  $y^{\rm e}$  perpendicular  $y^{\rm e}$  weights swinging do not rise (scarce) at all. If gravitation is alledged for proof, I answer that as well that, as magnetism & electri= city are particular & ye consequences of complex motions, & no proof of a power universall; what is pretended from y<sup>e</sup> ma= rine tydes will be considered afterwards. Then upon  $y^e$  whole, it is an ingenious contrivance (I confeSs) to bring things to bear so near, but withall a piece of machinery, fitter to come from a clock= maker, than from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  author of nature, whose works are simple & uncomplex. Here are 2 forces set on work to tugg against

(320)

### Physica

against each other for producing a mixt effect, as if ye creator needed two strings to his bow where one woud not serve, w<sup>ch</sup> without a revelation can scarce be believed. But what if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  motus in  ${\tt directum^{147}}$  be nothing at all reall, but only a relation, how should that have a reall effect, in opposition to y<sup>e</sup> centri= petall? w<sup>ch</sup> must be reall or nothing; so that a planet being poised, & as qui= escent in  $\overline{y^{e}}$  rolling aether, & (as they say) influenced centripetally, hath no ten= dency in directum but for restitution only, & ye contention is not between cen= tripetall & direct (per tangentes)<sup>148</sup> but between attraction & restitution, that is to & from  $y^e$  center,  $w^{eh}$  utterly ruines y<sup>e</sup> attractive scheme of y<sup>e</sup> planetary orbs. It was therefore well contrived to set up

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>147</sup> i.e., 'direct, or straight movement' (i.e., gravitational pull).

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 148}$  i.e., 'by means of a tangent'.

Physica (<del>321</del>) 134

set up a motus verus contra distinct from y<sup>e</sup> motus relativus,<sup>149</sup> in order to find a match for  $y^{\text{e}}$  centripetall,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is a positive agent (as was observed before). And what becomes of all  $y^e$  fine spun demonstra= tions to  $y^{\rm e}$  wast of so much good geo= metry, when  $y^e$  principles  $w^{ch}$  ought to be incontestable are precarious, & what is worse, denyed, & by no earthly means to be proved? And in Mathematiques,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  are  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$ vain pretense of this hypothesis,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  least tripp of a principle, or datum, overturns ye whole cargo. But now admitting all ye magnitudes, soliditys, & distances of y<sup>e</sup> pla= netary bodys from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun to be as they are esteemed, or for y<sup>e</sup> purpose contrived or gueSst at; yet  $y^{\text{e}}$  aspects & places are not (as I sayd) exactly correspondent, there= fore  $y^{\text{e}}$  collaterall attractions of  $y^{\text{e}}$  planets respecting

 $<sup>^{149}</sup>$  i.e., 'true (or absolute) motion against, as distinct from a relative motion'.

### (322) Physica

respecting each other reciprocally are in= troduced to set all right, (as I have above remarqued). And if any unaccountable deviations are found, as of Mars, & y<sup>e</sup> moon, then it is allegdged that such are caused by some unknown attraction not yet discovered. And in a word, y<sup>e</sup> truth of attraction proves y<sup>e</sup> courses & aspects of y<sup>e</sup> planets, & those prove y<sup>e</sup> truth of attraction, so Idem per Idem,<sup>150</sup> summs up y<sup>e</sup> evidence.

After this, I am to declare y<sup>e</sup> corpuscular hypothesis of y<sup>e</sup> heavens & y<sup>e</sup> probabili= tys of it. I go no further, not thinking it mends y<sup>e</sup> matter to cry out principia Mathematica, & demonstration. First upon what hath been alledged, it is presumed that all space is body, & y<sup>e</sup> whole world is perfectly fill'd with matter impenetrable. And next

107, The corpus= cular scheme of y<sup>e</sup> hea= vens ex= plained 135r

Physica (<del>323</del>) 135

And next that this matter is devided into parts inconceivably small, & smaller yet, & smaller ad infinitum, & such devisions signalized by a perpetuall motion or a= gitation of them, rendring y<sup>e</sup> whole to be one universall fluid, That  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun is a vast luminous maSs of fire; & a portion of y<sup>e</sup> Aether (as I must call y<sup>e</sup> universall fluid) comprehending y<sup>e</sup> planetary regi= ons, & further perhaps, as (for instance) half way between Saturn &  $y^{\rm e}$  fixed starrs perpetually, after  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  manner of a vortex, Rolls about  $y^e$  sun /but slower as more remote from  $y^e$  center  $\hfill {\hfill 151}$ The mi= nute parts of this vortex, like  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  casuall concourse of body's as stones, sand &c are of various forms, & magnitudes, Except where accident hath bro/u\ght similar parts toge= ther, or such as are apt to unite in moti= on, & not to diSsipate into ye common maSs. Of these  $y^{\rm e}$  largest, & most compact figures have

 $<sup>^{151}</sup>$  This correction added (in ink) by a different hand - using the greek 'e' characteristic of the hand responsible for the pencilled-in corrections elsewhere.

(324) Physica

have more force & perhaps perseverance in motion, than  $y^{\rm e}$  smaller & more spread, of  $y^{\text{e}}$  difference an  $\text{acco}^{\text{t}} \text{:}$  hath been given. It hath been also shewed, that all bodys impelled must move from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  contact by strait lines unleSs diverted by some re= sistance, & in a fluid action  $y^{\rm e}$  parts promiscuously impell & resist, & consequently y<sup>e</sup> stronger parts have more force to move in strait lines than  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  weaker; therefore when y<sup>e</sup> motion of y<sup>e</sup> whole is about a center, & withall y<sup>e</sup> parts continually agitated with reciprocall impulses;  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ common result is, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  strongest will most persevere in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rectilinear direc= tion, & that must produce a partiall reseSs & aceSs to & from  $y^{\rm e}$  center, a con= sequence of such prevailing force. This is mentioned comparatively, for all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ matter of  $y^{\rm e}$  vortex, (being free) for like

{\_}

108 The dis= tribution of matter in rolling about y<sup>e</sup> sun Physica (<del>325</del>) 136

like reason, draws from  $y^e$  center  $w^{eh}$  produceth a generall receSs & in{test} a distinction to & from  $y^e$  center, all  $y^e$  circumstances have been already stated, & may be further explai= ned.

So then taking y<sup>e</sup> impulses comparatively, as I said, there must follow a sort of fermentation in y<sup>e</sup> whole maSs, w<sup>ch</sup> will devide y<sup>e</sup> leSsmore from y<sup>e</sup> leSs powerfull matter. For y<sup>e</sup> former gaining outwards, y<sup>e</sup> latter must of neceSsi= ty (notwithstanding y<sup>e</sup> common tendency) yield & gather inwards, & croud about y<sup>e</sup> center, & y<sup>e</sup> weakest woud be at, or nearest to it, that is, y<sup>e</sup> largest & most compact forms woud be about y<sup>e</sup> circumference, & y<sup>e</sup> minor & most irregular, & dilated matter <u>about</u> <u>y<sup>e</sup> center</u>. And this must take place in all degrees from y<sup>e</sup> center outwards, unleSs it may so happen that there is sphears of similar matter, of w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> parts little exceed each other

(326.) Physica

each other in strength, & these may have no such cribration amongst them. But it is manifest, that if a parcell of circum= ferentiall matter is brought down, & near ye center lett loose, it wou'd not cease to work upwards, till it recovered its due place, & there to rest from that action; & on the other side if a parcell of y<sup>e</sup> cen= trall matter were removed up, & freed among ye superior, it wou'd be driven downwards, till it found its ballance near  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  center, or met with obstructions, & thence gravitation. And y<sup>e</sup> consequences woud be y<sup>e</sup> same, if y<sup>e</sup> matter were coagulated, as if, fluid or loose; for being pervious as all coagulum are, to  $y^e$  generall minuter matter,  $y^e$  force is convey= ed to all  $y^e$  component parths, so that such as belong to an higher sphear will work upwards, & such as appertain to a lower sphear, will work to that. This being ye state of y<sup>e</sup>

of  $y^e$  great Solar fluid, &  $y^e$  consequences, by mechanick laws, neceSsary, we have a prospect of a fair revsolution of  $y^e$  posi= tions & orbits of  $y^e$  planets.

Those who deal by attractions suppose their centripetal power to extend every way deminishing in a certain proportion regular= ly proceeding from y<sup>e</sup> center, & by means of that supposition,  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\&}}$  some others of like arbi= triment, etermine of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  states of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planets; but we must remove  $\underline{y^{\mathrm{e}}}\xspace$  state of that sup= postion, & conclude that ye condition of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  aether from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  center outwards is not stated in any regular progreSsion, but is subject to contingents; & all that can be determined is, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sphears, or (to use an apter word)  $y^{\rm e}$  orbs  $w^{\rm ch}$  contain  $y^{\rm e}$  stronger matter will be outermost, but (as I sayd) there may be orbs of similar matter, or such as have not such different powers to cause

109. No regu= lar pro= greSsion of power from y<sup>e</sup> center outwards.

### (328) Physica

cause any separation, but continue uni form, or some more or leSs so than others, so as to deprive that regularity of pro= greSsion from y<sup>e</sup> center, as they suppose; And this I mention because the{<u>ir c</u>}on futation of y<sup>e</sup> present hypothesis de= pends upon such supposall; So that we esteem y<sup>e</sup> Aetheriall powers to be as y<sup>e</sup> parts are powerfull in whatever dis= tant orbs they happen to fall.

Then it must be required that y<sup>e</sup> planets by an almighty power were at first placed in y<sup>e</sup> aether; whither neer or farr from y<sup>e</sup> sun (in this inquest) is not materiall. I say here will be two consequences 1. y<sup>e</sup> motion, 2 y<sup>e</sup> libration. 1. as to y<sup>e</sup> motion, y<sup>e</sup> current of y<sup>e</sup> aether will bear against y<sup>e</sup> body of each pla= net, untill all impulse of y<sup>e</sup> fluid upon it shall cease, & it shall move, conformly in y<sup>e</sup>

{\_}

110
Of y<sup>e</sup> motion
& libration
of y<sup>e</sup> planets

in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  current as if it were a part of it; And this is y<sup>e</sup> present state of each pla= net,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  relating to  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  fluid wherein it is immerst, is at rest, & no motion, co= natus or tendency<sup>152</sup> can be ascribed to it, but having relation to  $y^{\text{e}}$  fixt starrs,  $y^{\text{e}}$ sun, or to each other, a motion is accor dingly defined. And this manner of paSsing about y<sup>e</sup> sun, without any hurry, violence or new invented principles, but in a tran= quill manner, as bodys immerst in fluids are observed every day to move, or rather paSs is most plausible, for how shou'd we judge of those mighty revolves, but by a conformity with leSser,  $w^{ch}$  we may close= ly observe, since nature hath but one law, that governes both ye greatest & ye least Sys= tems of matter? & it is not true to say this body (or planet) hath a tendency in direction, & so fromwards  $y^{\rm e}$  center, more than y<sup>e</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>152</sup> 'Conatus' was an Aristotelian/scholastic term explaining movement as the result of a tendency to move, suggesting, therefore, a quality inherent in an object. The word confers an anthropomorphic will, or inclination, to the object. Although the notion of such a cause of movement (the object willing ...) would have been anathema to him, the word is one that Descartes himself used. RN also used it, although he frequently apologises for doing so, and he also apologises on behalf of Descartes for his employment of the term. Attraction would be a kind of 'conatus', and RN ubiquitously criticises this notion of an Aristotelian quality or tendency at the heart of the Newtonian system.

{\_}

111 The mea= sures of force to recede from y<sup>e</sup> center Physica

(330)

than  $y^e$ , {more than  $y^e$ } rest of  $y^e$  fluid in  $w^{ch}$ it /now\ swimms, & being (as I suppose) equal, then it is ballanced, & amounts in effect to nothing. But it was possible that  $y^e$ planets might have been put in places not so ballanced, or that they shoud deviate and then

2. I say that y<sup>e</sup> power of y<sup>e</sup> fluid parts to move in directum, is either equall, more, or leSs than that of y<sup>e</sup> parts that com pose any one planet Residing in it. If more, then y<sup>e</sup> action will detrude y<sup>e</sup> pla= net down to a place, where it will ballance, & so if leSs. y<sup>e</sup> planet will prevail, & rise till it meets with y<sup>e</sup> like, & then paS away with y<sup>e</sup> fluid tacitely in a perpetuall orb, as we see they all do, & this is properly a mo= tion of libration. There have been great mistakes in this matter, for Cartesius de termined y<sup>e</sup> ballance by y<sup>e</sup> solidity of y<sup>e</sup> planet Physica (<del>331</del>) 139

planet compared with  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  content of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ Aether,  $y^e$  place of  $w^{ch}$  it filled. And that indeed is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rule of bodys observable in fluido, because our common account of solidity, [....?] is taken by weight,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  here is not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  question, therefore it is not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ solidity, or content of ye planet, but ye condition of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  minute parts. For bodys may have equall quantity, & yet une= quall force to persevere according as in figure  $y^{\text{e}}$  component parts are more or leSs compact or spread. The other par= ty take advantage of this, & fall to pro= ving  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planets to be more or leSs solid than  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  Aether where they reside, whereas (if that cou'd be proved) it is not measure of substance, but ye forms of ye minute parts, that make y<sup>e</sup> question. As a sponge or whisp of straw under water, hath not force by  $y^{\text{e}}$  Exterior shew, but by  $y^{\text{e}}$  intrin=/sick  $\$ condition

## (332) Physica

condition of y<sup>e</sup> matter, therefore all their demonstrations upon those calcu= lates must fail. And surely nothing can prove a ballance surer than just scales; & y<sup>e</sup> very Aether, & planets ballancing in orbs so constantly one against y<sup>e</sup> other as they do, have y<sup>e</sup> pro= perty of y<sup>e</sup> truest scales.

There are many matters that ly ready to be discourst of concerning these 2 hypotheses, some for, & some against either, w<sup>ch</sup> if I shou'd spin out as long as y<sup>e</sup> subject woud bear, I shou'd be not only tiresome but tired; But I think in y<sup>e</sup> stating a few objections & answ/ers\ I may say as much or more than will be thought to y<sup>e</sup> purpose. For y<sup>e</sup> attrac= tive scheme, they say all y<sup>e</sup> courses & aspects answer so precisely, that it cannot but be true. To that I answer

(allowing

112. The au= thority of congruen= cy.

(allowing  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  congruency to be very egregi= ous) that it is a congruency at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  wrong end. That is, a congruency of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  effects, but without any congruence of /ye\ causes; ye former is of much leSs regard than  $y^{\rm e}$  latter, for effects= may be congruent to divers causes pro= posed, when but one cause can be true. But when a cause is congruent to /with  $y^e$ whole course of nature, tho y<sup>e</sup> effects do not in all circumstances (as we may opine) answer precisely, yet that may be with reason judged to be  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  true cause. For w<sup>ch</sup> take for instance Copernicus, who from a wonderfull congruency of his new scheme of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planets, con= cluded it to be true, altho all  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm phae}{=}$ nomena did not agree, for ye visible magnitudes of y<sup>e</sup> planets, being nearly  $y^e$  same, in  $y^e$  Apogee & perigee, was al=/most a con=

(334) Physica

a confutation; but he chose to be= lieve some future discoverys wou'd answer that objection, rather than [quite?] such a flaming probabillity in uni= versallibus^{153} as his scheme carryed; & so it fell out, for afterwards, telescopes, shewing y<sup>e</sup> magnitudes in true perspec= tive, not known in his time, made good his prophesy. So here I diferr more to  $y^e$  congruity of  $y^e$  cause, that is one universall flowing of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole solar fluid, with  $y^{\rm e}$  planets silently carryed along, some faster, others slow= er, in order (nearly) of distance from  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun, in one intire maSs. Whither all y<sup>e</sup> appearances to our thinking an= swer punctually or not; than to a more scrupulous account of some particulars tho derived upon a well contrived scheme of  $w^{ch}$ 

of  $w^{\rm ch}$  no part hath its fellow in  $y^{\rm e}$  ordi= nary course of nature.

Another thing alle/d\g'de against y<sup>e</sup> corpus= cular hypothesis is y<sup>e</sup> eternall continu= ance of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planetary courses without wasting, w<sup>ch</sup> doth not happen to any bodys whatsoever, moving (as we suppose) in pleno. It must be yielded that if y<sup>e</sup> planets were hurryed thro' y<sup>e</sup> Aether, as common bodys moving thro' ye air, it cou'd not continue without considera= ble loSs of speed. But ye case is not so; for in  $y^{\rm e}$  orbs  $y^{\rm e}$  planets have no vis impreSsa,<sup>154</sup> but are (quasi) at perfect rest. If any power supervening shou'd either impell, or retard  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  planet, then a motive effect (as in other like cir= cumstances) wou'd appear & not other= wise, but what say we to ye Grand course of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole Aether, must not that loose

113 Of y<sup>e</sup> de= crease in y<sup>e</sup> time of y<sup>e</sup> pla= netary re= volves.

141r

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 154}$  i.e., 'inertia, or impressed force or velocity'.

{\_}

{\_}}

(336) Physica

loose of its speed in proceSs of time? I answer not sensible in 100,000 myriads or more of years; Even  $y^{\rm e}$  globe of earth revolving diurnally, upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  measures of force & resistance before shewed, colla= ted with  $y^e$  gyrations of a childs {jigg}. coud not in many hundred thousand years shew any perceptible decrease. for if ye Gigg will make ten turns in a second carry on  $y^{\rm e}$  proportion of so= lidity or perseverance triplicate, & {.?}  $^{155}$ superficies or resistance duplicate up to  $y^e$  magnitude of  $y^e$  earth, &  $y^e$  re= sistance  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is by  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  superficies, wou'd be found next to nothing compara= tively. Here I cannot but wonder at y<sup>e</sup> vain industry of those who are plea= sed with computations of  $y^{\rm e}$  enorm ce= lerity of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planetary motions, as they take them to be, all w<sup>ch</sup> are but mag/nitudes\ that

 $^{\rm 155}$  An unidentified (by me, so far) editorial mark in pencil in the RH margin.

(<del>334</del>) 142 Physica that admitt all proportions;  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  motions being nothing  $pr{\underline{ae}}ten^{156}$  relations, & are {\_} no cause of wonderment, however some folks are apt to admire at such no= things. But to return. The ori= It is alledged against  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  attractive scheme that no account is given why all ye ginall  $settlem^t$ . planets shoud, as they do, keep close to of y<sup>e</sup> pla y<sup>e</sup> Zodiack & not deviate much nets frm  $y^{\text{e}}$  great circle of  $y^{\text{e}}$  ecliptick. Nor why all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  celestiall transitts, even y<sup>e</sup> praeceSsion of y<sup>e</sup> Aequinox as by com= on consent, shoud tend Eastwards. They might as well have moved from N. to S. or in any other rhumb or great cir= cle; & in a word, some one way, & some

or increase confusion; for altho y<sup>e</sup> sun's attraction

another, with out any apparent impe= diment, or contradiction on account of attraction, tending to reduce them to y<sup>e</sup> present order, but rather to make

## (338) Physica

attraction is Common, Each planet at= tracts for it self, & there are as many severall agents at work, as there are planets. But in y<sup>e</sup> other scheme, y<sup>e</sup> move= ment being directed all  $y^e$  same way, argues one common influence that rules them all, & that is  $y^e$  universall vortex, & y<sup>e</sup> planets are independant & uninfluentiall with regard to each other; & if it be said that y<sup>e</sup> almighty placed them, I answer, very true, for  $y^{\text{e}}$  world was created at once & not left to shufle it self into order. But it cannot be denyed that some things might be left, under a generall law, to second causes; & it may be that ye settlement of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  planets may be among them; for as preponderation might reduce, so equilibration may keep them in their places. And it is observable that  $y^{\text{e}}$  Zodiack is about  $y^{\text{e}}$  ecliptick,  $w^{\text{ch}}$ 

is y<sup>e</sup>

<red BM stamp>
$\frac{\underline{to}}{\{\underline{q}^{u}\}^{157}}$ (59)

115
Of y<sup>e</sup> Sub=
planets &
their libra=
tions

is  $y^e$  equator of  $y^e$  solar orb, & at  $y^e$ greatest distance from  $y^e$  two poles of it,  $\{\underline{\pm o}\}$  w<sup>ch</sup> (equator) all bodys im= merst in a turning fluid, <u>as well</u> from about  $y^e$  poles as elsewhere, must tend. Attraction can be no cause of such conformitys as these. & therefore claims no preference against a com mon course of things observed in  $y^e$ world. I take no notice of a late whim that distinguisheth between celestiall & terrestrial attraction, as ruled by different measures, because like li= berty will introduce aeriall, aqueous, metalline, & as many various attractions as ignorance shall have occasion for.

There is little said here of y<sup>e</sup> subpla= nets & y<sup>e</sup> con<del>seque</del>/veya\nces of them; as of y<sup>e</sup> moon about y<sup>e</sup> earth, & y<sup>e</sup> Satellites about Jupiter & Saturn, because those matters are included in y<sup>e</sup> consideration of y<sup>e</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>157</sup> An editor's mark (q<sup>u</sup>? *see* note on fol. 90v, above) is entered here. Is this querying what appears to be a reference to section 59 (which would be to fol 52v above)? If so, that query seems approriate as the reference is not ... helpful.

{\_}

## (340) Physica

of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Grand vortex, & have been touched before. For  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  supposall is only that there is an Epicyclar or minor vortex belonging to each of those tribes of pla= nets. And that such imply no contradic= tion. nor inconsistency, may be proved by y<sup>e</sup> experiment upon any watery sur= face Made to{ $\underline{t}$ } turn, in w<sup>ch</sup> minor tur= nings may be excited, w<sup>ch</sup> shall without any disorder be carryed about in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ great one. The proof of this is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  paSsage of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  Satellites about  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  grand planets, as that of those about y<sup>e</sup> sun. But ha= ving a neerer observation of  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  moon, we discern plainly a gravity (that is unequall power of receSs from y<sup>e</sup> center in  $y^{\text{e}}$  parts of  $y^{\text{e}}$  moon) because y<sup>e</sup> same phase is always obverted to= wards  $y^{\rm e}$  earth,  $w^{\rm ch}$  must be by libra= tion, as when a body is immerst in fluido y $^{\rm e}$  heavyest side (if there be such difference {concordance}

difference) will always be downwards. There is a conceipt that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  moon turns on a center but just so fast as in its orb shall always shew  $y^e$  same face to  $y^e$  earth, if {any } of faster & slower so to agree were poSsi= ble,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  effect might be argued; but as it is,  $y^{\text{e}}$  moon, say they, shews to  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun all its parts succeSsively as a thing that turns, w<sup>ch</sup> I allow must be so to all things without (as to  $y^{\rm e}$  sun) but to none within its orbit, as to y<sup>e</sup> earth. And it is proba= ble that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  satellites of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  other planets shew y<sup>e</sup> same, for (no turning being supposed) one side by common accident will be heavyer than  $y^{\rm e}$  other. And  $y^{\rm e}$ vertue of attraction cannot be introdu= ced here otherwise than in  $y^{\text{e}}$  /cases of common gravitation of bodys among us, of w<sup>ch</sup> as also of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  Lunar influences upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ 

marine

Physica

(342)

marine tydes, I shall imploy a few para= graphs apart, hoping to find some clea= ner solutions, than every one is aware of. And in y<sup>e</sup> mean time I shall take up y<sup>e</sup> subject of fire. As concerning  $\{/\!\!\!/\}$  vide y<sup>e</sup> notes 80.<sup>158</sup>

Of Fire.

80.

{comets}

Of fire, accension & extinction There is as much concern to know what fire is not{,} as what it is. For it is an object almost perpetually before our eyes, & being compound altogether of materiall parts indistinguishable, ap= pears in confused Ideas, & so becomes sub= ject to chimeriq & false notions. First it is not an elementary or specifick matter, distinct from all other terrene eSsences; for every thing we know is obnoxious, toby due means to become fire. And that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>158</sup> *see* above, fol. 100r.

# Physica (<del>343</del>) 145

And that makes me very attentive when  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{I}}$ find among y<sup>e</sup> naturall philosophers, a men= tion made of parts of fire, or fiery parti= cles, when I cannot but think they talk of they know not what. We are aSsured that no fire is to be had but by ye ministra= tin of some compound materiall, nor can it be continued without a continuall sup= ply of y<sup>e</sup> same, w<sup>ch</sup> is called fewel. What  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  nature of it is may in some mea= sure be obtained byy ye commom means, & that is a very violent motion,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  seldom & if violent enough, never fails to cause an accension. And of these means  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  most remarkable is ye /use of teel & flint; ye old con=ceipt was that fire was lodged in y<sup>e</sup> flint, but it is now found that ye sparks are pieces of steel fluxed by  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  violence of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  percuSsion. And as fire is bred, so it acts, by force [divelling?]  $y^{\rm e}$  parts of  $y^{\rm e}$  fewell, & sen=

(344) Physica

& sending most of it into  $y^{\rm e}$  air in vo= lumes of smoak, & other vapours leSs vi= sibe. And water not being accendible but evapo/u\rable, it sends it into y<sup>e</sup> air in steam, & by affusion of water, fire is extinguished, that is  $y^e$  rapid agitati= on of y<sup>e</sup> fiery action cohibited. But no= thing is more remarkable of fire, than that it will not subsist without a strong compreSsion of air upon it. For in y<sup>e</sup> pneumatick receiver, upon relax= ing  $y^{\text{e}}$  spring of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air, it immediately goes out. And not only such compreSsi= on of air is neceSsary to fire, but it must have space allowed, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air in circulating may ventilate; for upon any clausure it goes out.; therefore  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  storys plusquam aniles /of sepulchrall lamps\ are fables plusquam aniles.<sup>159</sup> And I may here obiter<sup>160</sup> observe, that life & fire have  $y^{\rm e}$  same friends & enemies

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>159</sup> i.e., 'old wives tales'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>160</sup> i.e., 'by the way'.

117.

world

{\_}}

The common fires of y<sup>e</sup>

enemys, for where fire will not con= tinue, life will not subsist.

The accumulating observations of y<sup>e</sup> course & efficacy of fire may inlarge  $y^e$  naturall history, but conduce  $\{\underline{little}\}$ little towards explaining y<sup>e</sup> phisicall state of it. But for that we must go a great way off, & interest y<sup>e</sup> sun, & regi= on of  $y^{\text{e}}$  planets, in order to a tollera= ble resolution. It will be remembred that  $\{\underline{that}\}\ y^e$  vortex of  $y^e$  sun being in perpetuall rotation,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  materiall by a kind of fermentation, becomes sorted, & ye most powerfull parts working out= wards y<sup>e</sup> leSs powerfull are detruded down towards  $y^{\rm e}$  center, & there, as I say, constitute  $y^{\rm e}$  body of  $y^{\rm e}$  sun;  $w^{\rm ch}$ consists of  $y^{\text{e}}$  minute & spread matter; And those are apt to exhibite two kinds of effects one bey reason of smallneSs, of fire

{\_}}

(346) Physica

fire; &  $y^{\rm e}$  other by reason of shapes to coagulate, but being so minute, apt as well to diSsolve or melt, as to coagu= late, & so one & other contingently. Now for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  moving part we must remember  $y^{\rm e}$  interstitiall matter,  $w^{\rm ch}$  is disperst all over  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  universe, as well circumference as center. And being one as yewe suppose at ye creation, with other things, after their manner, put into a way of moving ye same by mutuall & continuall im= pulses, must continue indefinitely. And wherever coagulums happen obnoxious to be discerped by this subtile action,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ effect is discerend as in common fermen= tations.

And admitting these premises, y<sup>e</sup> sun will be concluded to be a body of fire for it must consist of interstitial mat= ter chiefly, but withall sub-interstitiall also

118
The sun
a body
of fire &
its influ=
ence

also, for matter is of all magnitudes di= minishable/ing\ inad infinitum, [still?] y<sup>e</sup> finer de= truded towards  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  very center, where resides y<sup>e</sup> ultimate perfection of fire; but towards  $y^{\rm e}$  circumference of  $y^{\rm e}$ sun y<sup>e</sup> groSser of that subtile matter re= sides, w<sup>ch</sup> by reason of forms, as well as magnitudes, may be leSs combustible, & apt to make some coagulums, & those to break up again, as fires increase & diminish accidentally,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  appear by  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$ maculae & faeculae observed to paSs upon or near  $y^{\text{e}}$  body of  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun. And it is not unlikely that ye sun hath an At= mosphear of pure fire such as our purest flames, with some smoak perhaps that extend to a great distance round it, & thus y<sup>e</sup> sun being a residence of y<sup>e</sup> Sub= tilest matter, moving with greatest rapidity, hath

### (348) Physica

hath, influence more or leSs to agitate more remote subtile matter, & there= by to excite warmth (according to our sence) where y<sup>e</sup> like subtile matter occurs; & if any of that be susceptible to accend, it must so accend as we find in many instances, particularly. y<sup>e</sup> phos= phorous wax, w<sup>ch</sup>, hot from y<sup>e</sup> still, will in y<sup>e</sup> open air, become fire.<sup>161</sup>

I say'd that fire cou'd not subsist without a compreSsion, & there is enough of that at y<sup>e</sup> place of y<sup>e</sup> sun, for y<sup>e</sup> combusti= ble matter., doth as it were gravitate into it; & without such compreSsure all fire must diSsipate, as (concerning our culinary fires) will be shewed. But it will be asked whence is y<sup>e</sup> aliment that conserves y<sup>e</sup> suns fire alive, for we find a supply of fewell, as neceSsary to fire, as food

119. The cir= culation of fire at y<sup>e</sup> sun

 $<sup>^{161}</sup>$  RN explains and illustrates his (relatively early) acquaintance with phosphorus (first isolated in 1669) in BL Add MS 32546, fol. 168r ff.

Physica (<del>349</del>) 148

as food to animalls? The answer to that is obvious, for granting that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fury of  $y^{\rm e}$  sun disperseth vast quantitys of mat= ter in fire & smoak,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same cause that brought it there at first, will return it back again combustible, as soot will burn as well as y<sup>e</sup> very fewell that made it; & so there is at ye sun, a perpetuall circulation of combusti= ble matter, being smoak or vapour, & fire alternately; & thus  $y^{\rm e}$  sun wor= king by perpetuall diSsipations, coa= gulations & fluxions of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same matter going & returning, is ye only perpetu= all motion, if there be such a thing, in ye<sup>e</sup> world. However I think here is given a familiar resolution of  $y^e$  na= ture & cause of  $y^{\rm e}$  suns fire. And now it is time to retire to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planets, where we reside, & to observe  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  analogy of

particular

(350) Physica

particular fires with  $y^{\rm e}$  common fire at  $y^{\rm e}$  sun.

It was not an ill thought of Cartesius, that (ever supposing  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world was made in perfection at once) there was a poSsi= bility that coagulums might get y<sup>e</sup> better of ye suns fire & so choak it, & that other suns (or fixed starrs some of w<sup>ch</sup> are ob= served to /have\ vanished, & then to have re= vived, & some never to be seen more) may have been so served: & who can answer what alterations of that Kind have been in y<sup>e</sup> Nebulae & Galaxy? And any of those minor starrs of in= finite numbers from fluid fire, beco= ming continued solids., may change their ballance, & go astray till finding a ballance in other vortexes, become planets, & for fail, comets perpetually errant; & y<sup>e</sup> proper vortexes be absorpt w<sup>ch</sup> first

## Physica (<del>351</del>) 149

 $w^{\rm ch}$  first happening might be  $y^{\rm e}$  cause of y<sup>e</sup> rest; & some c<del>ar</del>/ar\rying their weakened vortexes & [.....?] subplanets with them, ob= tain such settlements as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth, Jupiter, & Saturn are seen to have. But he was mistaken in one chief article of his scheme of y<sup>e</sup> heavens, w<sup>ch</sup> was that y<sup>e</sup> motion of  $y^e$  sun continued  $y^e$  motion of  $y^e$  vor= tex, & that failing ye vortex was expo= sed to be absorped by its neighbours, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  gyration of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  planets on their axes rather depends on their revolving of their vortexes than these on them. But these are fancys of no import to us; it is certain that their is a vortex in  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$ y<sup>e</sup> earth swimms, & all y<sup>e</sup> consequences of a vortex, w<sup>ch</sup> are y<sup>e</sup> crowding y<sup>e</sup> sub= tiler matter toward ye center. And altho  $y^{\rm e}$  earth is covered with coagu= lums, yet there is a warmth about it,

& much

	(352)	Physica
{_}}	& much of y <sup>e</sup> ma very accendible to y <sup>e</sup> contrary but be that as there is a maSs in a form we ca { <u>lying</u> }, lying of y <sup>e</sup> earth wit	teriall, as sulphur e, & for ought we know pure fire at y <sup>e</sup> center, it will: wee are sure s of terrene fluid matter all y <sup>e</sup> Atmosphear, continually upon y <sup>e</sup> surface th a gret weight, & what
100	influence this	hath upon fire is to be
The in=	considered	
terstitiall	T have often me	entioned v <sup>e</sup> subtile inters=
matter	titiall matter	w <sup>ch</sup> is no where excluded,
y <sup>e</sup> <del>a</del> true	but is continue	ed all y <sup>e</sup> world away over, &
anima	is very influer	ntiall in most of our ter=
mundi	restriall phaer esteemd y <sup>e</sup> true	nomena, & may justly be anima mundi. It is
100 <sup>162</sup>	efficacious in operations of f not so much der as from y <sup>e</sup> subt	nothing more than in y <sup>e</sup> fire where of y <sup>e</sup> force is rived from y <sup>e</sup> fewell tile matter. The power of that

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 162}$  (presumably) see above fol. 113v.

that is not confined to any compaSs, but hath a communication more or leSs with all  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  circuma<br/>  $bm bient\xspace$ indefinitely. This subtile matter in= tersperst among  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  parts of fewell however combustibe, altho always in swift agitation, hath not power to excite (ordinarily) an accension; for minuter parts separatim have little power over greater. But when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ Ice is broke (as they say) & a little ac= tuall fire is applyed,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  accension shall take & consume or diSsipate  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole maSs. The reason of this is that parts once actually set on fire have power to agitate  $y^e$  adjacent parts of  $y^e$  few= ell; & then  $y^e$  subtile matter rushes in, & Joyning  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  motions with greater swiftneSses; increase, dilate, & continue. for smaller bodys by their adjunct will not

## (359) Physica

not only sustein y<sup>e</sup> motions of greater, but also augment them. As of swing pendulums, & raising a steeple bell. It is no wonder therefore that fire begun by a slight touch shall run thro a maSs of proper fewell, when upon y<sup>e</sup> first overture y<sup>e</sup> subtile matter enters & cooperates in y<sup>e</sup> action. And (however y<sup>e</sup> fuell by diSsipation may be wasted) y<sup>e</sup> force of y<sup>e</sup> subtile matter rather increaseth /by y<sup>e</sup> heat\ round about.

122.
Fire dis
tinguish't,
& air (preS=
sing) ne=
ceSsary

is when  $y^{\rm e}$  whole effect of fire & suc= ceeds all at once, or appears so to us. In all these instances  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  subtile matter is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  principall agent, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fewell is sluggish, & what shoud move it, but that w<sup>ch</sup> is mixt amongst it? But that  $w^{ch}$  preserves fire in a body, & makes it a object of our observa tion, is y<sup>e</sup> air by y<sup>e</sup> urgency of its preS= sure: 1. In heat,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air is intermixt with ye  $\{ \underline{/ \ fewel} \} l$  , & all ye matter raised & diSsipated is taken into  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  body of  $y^{\rm e}$  air, & contributes to  $y^{\rm e}$  common mix= ture, as when we see steam & smoak rise & disperse every way till it is va= nished, & so becomes common air. The preSsure hath no part in this action, but only to receive & aSsimilate what riseth. But 2. when a coal is kindled y<sup>e</sup> air, by preSsing, keeps close y<sup>e</sup> accension as in a case that contains  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fewell from dispersing

{ rising}

{\_}}

{<u>kindled</u>

<u>coal</u>}

(356) Physica

dispersing; For  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fire is always urgent against this preSsure, tending to diSsi= pate, or as they say evapourate, &  $\{\underline{/y^t} \setminus \}$ succeeds, not all at once, but gradieually as  $y^{\rm e}$  parts intermix with  $y^{\rm e}$  ambient air. And when  $y^{\rm e}$  force of that exha= ling matter is sufficient to beat back y<sup>e</sup> air, so that it doth not intermix with y<sup>e</sup> {fewell} /accension\,<sup>163</sup> one superficies clas= ping close to  $y^{\text{e}}$  other,  $y^{\text{e}}$  coal continues to burn, but if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  exhalation grows languid, &  $y^{\rm e}$  preSsure of  $y^{\rm e}$  air gets ground, & as it were unites with heated matter ye fire goes out, & so also when by suc= tion, as in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air pump,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  preSsure is relieved;  $y^e$  action of  $y^e$  subtile matter, together with y<sup>e</sup> parts of fewell actu= ated by it, disperse all at once, & ye fire ceaseth. So that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\boldsymbol{e}}$  air is a confinement that keeps  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fire together, & also by  $y^{\rm e}$  agitation of  $y^{\rm e}$  adjacent

parts

 $<sup>^{163}</sup>$  The word 'accension' inserted in ink in a different hand, the word 'fewell' struck out in ink; the word 'fewell' is underlined in pencil and the words in the margin are in pencil.

parts, contributes to  $y^e$  accension of  $y^e$  few= wll, w<sup>ch</sup> is proved by applying a current of air to  $y^e$  coal, for that, by friction exas= perates  $y^e$  fire exceedingly; And without some Lambent transition of  $y^e$  air upon  $y^e$  face of this sort of fire, it will hard= ly live, such effect hath friction to sus= tein as well as to excite or kindle fire. But  $y^e$  chief remarque here is, that when  $y^e$  action is strong enough to repell  $y^e$  air, so that  $y^e$  fewell &  $y^e$  air have distinct superficies, without interfering totally, then it is fire, or else, not, as I may fur= ther elucidate afterwards.

The next state of fire is inflamation; It is certein that all fire whatever e= vapourates, & <del>red</del>thereby reduceth y<sup>e</sup> com= bustibles to a faese. But y<sup>e</sup> composition of fewell

123 The diffe= rence be= tween smoak & flame

(358) Physica

fewell is of Matter, as to that Energy, very different, for some parts separate with much leSs violence than others; as at y<sup>e</sup> beginning of a combustion, there is a plentifull separation that appears in  $y^e$  form of smoak; & at  $y^e$  conclusion also, a meer coal still evapourates, but not so groSsly to be made visible as smoak is, of w<sup>ch</sup> (smoak) I take y<sup>e</sup> materiall to consist of combustible parts, w<sup>ch</sup> were separated, but not kindled. Whereas  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  steam from a coal is matter w<sup>ch</sup> hath undergone a combus= tion, & after that, exhales in  $y^{\rm e}$  form of ashes dispersing. Now when smoak riseth,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air is intermixt with it, as well as conjoyned to  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  fewell from whence it is derived, & y<sup>e</sup> parts continu= ally separate [untill] in  $y^e$  air untill it is consi=

Physica (<del>359</del>) 153

consimilated, & lost in it. Now  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  heat urging continually more & more, at length  $y^{\rm e}$  parts of smoak take fire, & are kindled,  $y^{\text{e}}$  eCrisis of  $w^{\text{ch}}$  transit of  $y^{\text{e}}$ form, from smoak to fire & contra, is  $y^{\text{e}}$  repelling  $y^{\text{e}}$  air from all intermix= ture with it, or not; for when y<sup>e</sup> agita= tion of y<sup>e</sup> fumose matter is so power= full, as to resist y<sup>e</sup> preSsure of y<sup>e</sup> At= mospheare, then it is f{<u>lam</u>}e & not smoak, & when y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear gets ground, & intermixeth,  $y^{\rm e}$  flame goes out, &  $y^{\rm e}$ stream becomes smoak, & in this tran= sit there are no degrees, but either way all is done at once. So that Flame is nothing but smoak kindled, & during y<sup>e</sup> burning, {Flame} as to air is a Tor= icellian vacuity. This proved by a common boys experiment: as make a pure

{<u>broader</u>}

{\_}}

124. A lu= men at= tends smoak

{\_}

(360) Physica

pure flame in a pitcher & suddently invert y<sup>e</sup> mouth into a bason of wa= ter y<sup>e</sup> flame in that instant goes out, & y<sup>e</sup> pitcher sucks y<sup>e</sup> water out of y<sup>e</sup> bason, in great fury & in large quantity.

There are divers things to be taken no= tice of relating to flame. As that y<sup>e</sup> parts of fireSmoak set on fire, {()separate= ly considered{)} are but of a moments continuance in that form. But flame w<sup>ch</sup> is but a succeSsion of minute ac= centions seems a continued substance; & as to that, I must say that altho a particle, as to sence, is (quasi) nothing, many together make a sensible appea= rance. As one lighted candle at distance, may not be seen, & 40 together will be very visible, all which are but of

candle

Physica (<del>361</del>) 154

candle strength. The flame of a can= dle it self consists of minor flames, of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  pabulum as specks of fire paSsing us in a current. So one straw makes an inconsiderable fire, but a quantity of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same will raise a pyramid as high as an house, & y<sup>e</sup> whole is made up of y<sup>e</sup> fire of single straws, & even that, as I may say, of single sparks. The like is true of  $y^e$  Galaxy, & six hundred other instances; & of all manner of Energys where many small things cooperate; As I shall observe when I come to y<sup>e</sup> subject of light; But of this matter I shall but here /but\ only hint, that  $y^{\rm e}$ Metamorphosis of smoak into flame & e contra, is, to our sight, done in a moment; & so is perceived by light &

opacity

### (362) Physica

opacity. For till y<sup>e</sup> light appears, y<sup>e</sup> profluvia are amoak, but then it be= comes flame; For nothing leSs than actull combustion hath strength to beat off y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear, & that force, & not leSs, procures y<sup>e</sup> sensations of com= mon light.

It is notorious that whenever there is smoak, flame, or any exhalation, there is a stream upwards. As first, that there must be <u>a current is necessary</u>, for y<sup>e</sup> fewell discharged being rarifyed will expand some way; & that will proove to be in y<sup>e</sup> upright, & not Laterally, unleSs some force from y<sup>e</sup> air, as in a wind, diverts it. And this determination our vertuosi ascribe to y<sup>e</sup> lighneSs of y<sup>e</sup> vapour; for if y<sup>e</sup> air is heavier, that

(vapour)

125. No fire without a current of air that tends to y<sup>e</sup> upright. notes 19. 44.<sup>164</sup>

# Physica (<del>363</del>) 155

(vapour) must needs mount. And one of them fancyed that by his microscopes he discerned  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  waters stream to consist of small bubbles,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  he concluded were filled with some refined matter, as fire; & by that means  $y^{\rm e}$  air became re= pleat with these vapours, w<sup>ch</sup>, breaking, became clouds, & rain; & when  $y^{\rm e}$  air had fewer vapours, or they kept aloft, there was fair weather, but more of this, if I shall happen to talk of me= teors. Nowe  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  vapours from fire, whether steam, smoak, or flame, with respect to ye air, are neither light nor heavy, but being of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same nature with it, & intermixt, do ballance, & conform to all  $y^{\text{e}}$  motions, or waivings of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air w<sup>ch</sup> way soever it goes. But y<sup>e</sup> preSsure of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  Atmosphear diminishing upwards,

y<sup>e</sup> resis=

(364) Physica

 $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  resistance is leSs that way, than any, other, & on that  $\texttt{accot}\ y^{\texttt{e}}\ \texttt{current},\ \texttt{w}^{\texttt{ch}}\ \texttt{flows},$ from all fire, will go upwards, & when there is no more combustion, then as other smoak (but in  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  form of ashes) becomes air. All this is egregiously experienced by  $y^e$  flame of a candle, or lamp,  $w^{ch}$ circulates y<sup>e</sup> air, & y<sup>e</sup> preSsure drives y<sup>e</sup> pabulum up y<sup>e</sup> [weak?], as way is (by y<sup>e</sup>  $bu\{\underline{rn}\}ing\{\underline{)}\}$  made for it. And  $y^e$  flame re sisting{)} y<sup>e</sup> airs preSsure most at first is rounder, & then grows weaker, & thereby together with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  flowing current of  $y^{\rm e}$  matter becomes pyramidall, & what doth not expire in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  paSsage, deter mines in a dry Ashy smoak. Without these efficient causes,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  flame, as other unconfined fluids in y<sup>e</sup> air, must be per= fectly round. And by these and all other instances

{\_}}

## Physica

(<del>365</del>) 156

instances, it appears that about us  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ weight of y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear is y<sup>e</sup> causa sine qua non^{165} of all fire & flames & that except it be about y<sup>e</sup> center of a vortex, or in some Elastick Atmos= phear, there neither is, nor can be such a thing as fire in y<sup>e</sup> world. And what heat subsists in  $y^e$  aether at large, where is no Sulphur or other pabu= lum of fire, None of us can know, nor confidently pronounce it to in= crease from our common heat by proxi= mity to y<sup>e</sup> sun, in such immane pro= portion as  $y^e$  moderns are pleased to calculate, more to excite wonder than to increase knowledge.

I have considered that our known com= pound materialls are differently qua= lifyed as to fire, some for smoak & flame,= some to exhale without flame, some to Liquefy

126. The opera= tions of fire not to be minute= ly accoun= ted for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>165</sup> i.e., 'cause without any equal'.

## (366) Physica

liquefy or vitrity only, & some to all these one after another, & so readyer or slower to accend, & some to explode, & by reason, of y<sup>e</sup> exillity of y<sup>e</sup> energe= tick particles, these matters are im= poSsible to be crittically accounted for by any observations we can make. I shall persue no further varietys, & de= clare only y<sup>e</sup> GroSs effects, with y<sup>e</sup> poSsi= bilitys conceivable to be y<sup>e</sup> cause of them. But I must except one article of y<sup>e</sup> most stupendious consequence, & that is explosion, w<sup>ch</sup> I shall endeavour to look more narrowly into.

In order to come at this subject, it is expedient to take up some one egregi= ous example of explosion, & that, if it may be understood, will give a light to all y<sup>e</sup> rest, & I think none more pro= per than our common gunpowder, w<sup>ch</sup>

takes

127 of explo= sions & how takes fire from a small spark, & at one heave doth wonders. The materialls are Sulphur  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  readyest of any thing to take fire, Nitre, that burns pervica= riously, & charcoal as a sort of Tinder to kindle & communicate  $y^{\rm e}$  fire; these inflamables, all pulverized well to= gether, & granulated are ready for use. I shall beginn with a particle of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  impalpable dust, before it is granulated; & in that we find all  $y^{\rm e}$ ingredients,  $w^{\rm ch}$  (by means of  $y^{\rm e}$  coal) be= ing fired, must emitt a small flame; for  $y^e$  whole substance, as smoak, is in= flammable, ye Sulphur & Nitre, w<sup>ch</sup> a= part are slow burners, breaking each others body by  $y^{\text{e}}$  mixture, diSsipate all together, & become a flammulae, 166 in w<sup>ch</sup>, besides  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  materiall ( $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  extant, as in all rarefactions being multiply dilated)

nothing

(368) Physica

nothing but  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  subtile matter is contained, & that with a common force, derived from all parts without, agitates & forceth  $y^{\rm e}$ inflamed matter against  $y^e$  air, that preS= seth against it, till at last it is absorpt, & becomes air it self. This wou'd not happen if y<sup>e</sup> body were not first lifted or broke by y<sup>e</sup> application of externall fire, but then, as I sayd before, y<sup>e</sup> subtile matter agitates  $y^{\text{e}}$  parts into a rarefaction,  $w^{\text{ch}}$ is flame; & that is best understood by  $y^{\text{e}}$  effect of a single pulviscule, of  $w^{\text{ch}}$ y<sup>e</sup> force to expand against y<sup>e</sup> preSsure of  $y^{\rm e}$  air, belonging to all flame, little & great whatsoever, is not in propor= tion inconsiderable.

Now supposing another pulviscule con= tiguous, that must be fired from this, & then there is two flames joyned, w<sup>ch</sup> require double space, & so more till a granule is fired

128.
The proceSs
& increase
of explosive
powers

## Physica (<del>369</del>) 158

is fired, of  $w^{\rm ch}\ y^{\rm e}$  flame is (nearly) instanta= neous, & how much dilated in manifest to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  eye; And  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  reason of granulating is that thro y<sup>e</sup> interstices, w<sup>ch</sup> are large, y<sup>e</sup> fire of one granule may have convey= ance or acceSs so as to kindle many at or near ye same time, for if ye pulviscu= lae are compact close together,  $w^{\rm ch}$  they call wild fire, they kindle succeSsively one after another, & so burn in time, & have not an explosive effect, w<sup>ch</sup> de= pends wholly of qualitys almost instan= taneously rarefyed into flame. I propose this image  $w^{\rm ch} \; I$  have allready made use of; take a single straw & fire it,  $w^{\rm ch}\; will \; {\rm pro=}\;$ duce a small flame, add another & then  $y^{\rm e}$  flame is double, & so accumula= ting more, y<sup>e</sup> flame by such addittion, will inlarge, till it becomes as large as an house with a larger pyramid. This fire being

## (370) Physica

being graduall, shews no manner of ex plosion; but supposing all that flame to be generated (almost) at once, one cannot but conceive y<sup>e</sup> manner of ex= plosions. And  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  mighty power of them is not derived from  $y^{\rm e}$  parts of  $y^{\rm e}$  few= ell, w<sup>ch</sup> are paSsive, & a mean whereby y<sup>e</sup> unlimited power of y<sup>e</sup> subtile matter (y<sup>e</sup> soul of all rarefication) acts. When y<sup>e</sup> materiall is agitated whereby y<sup>e</sup> sub= tile matter, that is much quicker, & backt from without; lays hold, &  $y^{\rm e}$ materiall also reacting upon that, there is a combined force to rarefy,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$ is seen & practised every day in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  use of explosive powers.

Hereby it appears that y<sup>e</sup> whole work of every explosion consists in y<sup>e</sup> difference, when y<sup>e</sup> fewell takes fire gradually, & when all at once. For whatever y<sup>e</sup> mate/riall\ is, if

129. Instantane= ous accen= sions ex= plode {\_}

is, itf eaitn can be so kindled  $\{\underline{as}\}$ , it hath ye effect of gunpowder. Aurum ful= minans,  $^{167}$  & even GlaSs pulveriszed (as in brazing of iron) will explode, & with no small force; but not being handy as they say, nor kindleable without a very strong fire, & requiring time, they cannot be applyed to use. Bodys that do not flux without y<sup>e</sup> utmost force of fire, as some metatalls, stones, earth, & such things as turn to vitrification, or emitt little vapour, & none accen= dible, make no explosion; bodys apt to evapourate all, as water, if put in a furnace, so strong as to throw it into vapour all at once; furnace house & all go for't. So many are ye varietys of combustibles, w<sup>ch</sup> are exercised by fire; & produce divers effects, that most are not to be accounted for but by chimists, whose work

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>167</sup> lit: 'exploding gold'. Aurum fulminans was discovered by alchemists in the later sixteenth century. Gold dissolved in Aqua Regis (nitro hydrochloric acid) precipitated a powder which proved sensitive not only to heat, but also vibration. It was the first high explosive.

130

work it is to persue them. It is remar= kable that  $y^e$  [....?] of a burning glaSs^{168} will melt but not move gunpowder to an explosion because it is y<sup>e</sup> ac= tion of a subtiler matter, & common flame will scarce do it. And it must be a culinary for that purpose, as y<sup>e</sup> sparks froform a steel & flint, w<sup>ch</sup> are melted mettall or some groSs fewell, that will fire gunpowder. It seems that parts of some magnitude & force must be applyed to make a rupture & raise a fiery action in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  materiall of Gunpowder. The subtile matter or athereall parts will not do it alone, but after they are lett in, & commixt, work effectually. The heat preceeding diSsolution by fire, Of mettalls heated & ig= must be an actuall agitation of y<sup>e</sup> nis lambens matter, w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> touch discovers, especially in terrene

Physica

(372)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>168</sup> i.e., a magnifying glass focusing the sun's rays.

## Physica (<del>373</del>) 160

in terrene or mettaline bodys, for those  $[\ensuremath{\,{\scriptscriptstyle\bullet}}\xspace^\circ]$  without changing  $y^e$  exterior form, will rend & tear most things. But in these ca= ses y<sup>e</sup> subtile matter hath y<sup>e</sup> greatest share, &  $y^{\rm e}$  solid, without separation, bears a concuSsion of  $y^{\text{e}}$  groSser parts, & in some sort a dislocation, w<sup>ch</sup> is proved by y<sup>e</sup> nea= ling of mettalls, altho in y<sup>e</sup> groSs they do not, or very slowly, diSsolve, or flux, & then y<sup>e</sup> heat abating coagulate again; ye secrets of w<sup>ch</sup> effects will not be known; All hitherto of  $y^{\text{e}}$  ignis ardens, as for  $y^{\text{e}}$ ignis lambens,<sup>169</sup> it hath nothing common with  $y^e$  other, but  $y^e$  name & a faint lumen, & more properly belongs to  $y^{\rm e}$ subject of light, whereto it stands referred.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>169</sup> i.e., 'burning fire' and 'kindling fire' (*see* BL Add MS 32545, fol. 215r). *Ignis lambens* literally translated is 'licking fire'. Here MN uses the term to refer to the cold 'fire' of phosphorescence.

(131) Of y<sup>e</sup> won= derfull paSsage of light & (374) Physica

Of light & Colours

The action  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  causeth our sence of light is extant in y<sup>e</sup> whole luminated space, & at one &  $y^{\rm e}$  same time, or rather at all times, by instantaneous influence trajects all manner of ways, extror= sum, retrorsum, decuSsation, continu= atim, 170 without reciprocall impediment or disorder; altho  $y^{\rm e}$  same medium is perpetually concerned in  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  conveyance. All  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  may be perceived by any person that looks about him abroad or within doors, where any light shines; for all points in a lighted room are seen by strait lines alternatively to, at & from all points of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  confines; so that every point of  $y^e$  medium hath all  $y^e$  others croS= sing thro' it by infinite intersections.

All  $w^{ch}$
All  $w^{\rm ch}$  speculation is so repleat /with\ mistery, that ye whole world of physicall phi= losophy hath not yet gained a tolerable analysis, whence to hope for a resolu= tion. The Epicureans supposed certain refined species to flow perpetually from luminous bodys to  $y^{\text{e}}$  visuall organ,  $w^{\text{ch}}$ is a fancy so senceleSs, & precarious, & with= all full of absurditys that it is imper= tinent to note them. But with a view of somewhat of like nature to be ob= served afterwrds, I shall here note that how thinn soever these species are supposed to be, they are somewhat, & that materiall, y<sup>e</sup> perpetuall flowing of them (by night & by day) directly & trans= versly infinities, croSs & thro each other without interruption or confusion, all over  $y^{\text{e}}$  atomicall world,  $^{171}$  is such a maSs of impoSsibillitys, as cannot for a moment a moment

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 171}$  The Epicureans also proposed an atomical theory of matter.

132. Of y<sup>e</sup> Cartesian attempt & of rays (376) Physica

a moment be endured.

There is nothing in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  antiq philosophy of this subject worthy to be mentio= ned, till we come to Cartesius, whose dis= courses are most explicite, &, as I think, border upon truth more sensible, than any others have done, but yet leave us in doubt, what is light? He hath used ye image of a vintage table, to shew ye poSsibillity that a promiscuous ac= tion may have effect by right lines qua= quaversum; And every fluid & solid con= sidered by its parts, doth ye same; but what is this to  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  force of light? As to that he hath a most nice distin= ction, between motus & actio. He will not say that actio is motus but that it is propensio ad motum, & what that is Quaere?<sup>172</sup> I have shewed already that there is no medium between moving  $\ensuremath{\&}$ 

not moving

 $<sup>^{172}</sup>$  i.e., 'He will not say that action is motion, but that it is a propensity, or tendency to motion, and what is that I ask?' - the answer in Descartes' own words would be 'conatus', see note on fol. 138r, above.

# Physica (<del>377</del>) 162

not moving, & that conatus, tendency, & propensio adrem but analogys, & really nothing at all. But unde<sup>173</sup> that actio in a luminary w<sup>ch</sup> excites th<del>is</del>at propen= sio? an account of this is chiefly wan= ted, & for want of it we are as far from knowing what is light, as if no= thing at all were say'd of of it. The account of rays given by him, is in= genious, & it is that they are no other but y<sup>e</sup> right lines of y<sup>e</sup> tendency or pro= pension, & if  $y^{\rm e}$  tendency be nullity what are y<sup>e</sup> rays? I believe never poor word was so bandyed thro. voluminous scien= ces of y<sup>e</sup> opticks, as that (of rays) taking up y<sup>e</sup> whole matter of y<sup>e</sup> argumenta= tion, & withall so little understood.

Wee come now to y<sup>e</sup> last attempt in order to render y<sup>e</sup> theory of light & co= lours compleat to be found in y<sup>e</sup> justly admired

133. The New= tonian Hypthe= sis & pro= greSsion

<sup>173</sup> i.e., 'where is'.

(378)

admired optica of Sr Isaak Newton; but here we must stand & look about us, to see that no danger is near, for me are entring into y<sup>e</sup> sanctum sanctorum, & to contravert any thing held forth by that great author, must needs be pia cu=  $lar;^{174}$  therefore I shall use this cautelous distinction. Wch is between ye cause of light, & ye naturall history of light & colours. As for  $y^{\rm e}$  latter, &  $y^{\rm e}$  optick con= sequences, Nothing that I can say can come near  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  value of that work; for w<sup>ch</sup> reason, & because I am not mas= ter of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  experiments, I adventure not amongst them, or meddle with  $y^{\rm e}$  in= ferences. But as to  $y^{\text{e}}$  cause of light,  $w^{\text{ch}}$ is my proper undertaking, I shall do no great harm, for  $y^e$  great author declines all that is physicall in that subject, & referrs wholly to matters of fact &

Physica

<sup>174</sup> sanctum sactorum, i.e., ` the holy of holies; perhaps 'pia culpa'? an error in faith, a heresy.

## Physica (<del>379</del>) 163

fact & experiment. But for  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  clearer conduct of those he hath contrived an hypothesis. And from ye many con= gruitys of that, his followers argue to  $y^{\text{e}}$  reall truth of it; The hypothesis is this. That light is a collection of rays, that is, Heterogene strings variously colou= red, that move in time (but inconceiva= bly swift) from y<sup>e</sup> luminary to all pla= ces quaquaversum by strait lines; that these rays at ce/ce\rtain paSses reflect, & refract from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  direct course. That some coloured rays refract to a greater angle than others, & altho  $\{\underline{are}\}$  differently coloured yet all are comprisd in & shew as com= mon light; & when refractions happen,  $y^{\text{e}}$  unequall refrangibillitys of  $y^{\text{e}}$  coloured rays lays them all apart, Redds, blues, yellows, purples &c by themselvs as in  $y^{\rm e}$ rainbow, & common prismall inspections And there

{\_}

## (380) Physica

And these influences falling upon y<sup>e</sup> or= gn of sight are y<sup>e</sup> cause of our sence of light & colour. I might here as well say reflectible as ref+rangible, in diffe= rent angles. If y<sup>e</sup> one follows y<sup>e</sup> laws of motion, why not y<sup>e</sup> other? & so equally produce colours, w<sup>ch</sup> we find not conse= quent; but speculums give us y<sup>e</sup> whole nature of reflections.

Now without any altercation upon this hypothesis, I shall apply to y<sup>e</sup> root; y<sup>e</sup> only thing affirmed at y<sup>e</sup> entrance of y<sup>e</sup> book /work\ is that light is somewhat, that moves locally through y<sup>e</sup> medium, w<sup>ch</sup> is pro= ved by shewing that an opack body interposing stopps y<sup>e</sup> course of light, & y<sup>e</sup> removall of it letts it pass. This by no means inferrs a locall progression of y<sup>e</sup> light, tho it intercepts y<sup>e</sup> effect of y<sup>e</sup> agitation that is y<sup>e</sup> means of light, of w<sup>ch</sup> more afterwards, as also of time

in y<sup>e</sup>

134. Light not progreSsive nor sub= stantiall

## Physica (<del>381</del>) 164

in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  paSsage. In  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  mean while observe this gradient light affects our sence, w<sup>ch</sup> must be by touch, & that of body. Then observe what innumerable impoSsibilli= tys occurr here[ass?]. ye stream of this cor= poreall light, from  $y^{\rm e}$  sun (at least) is perpetuall, & from all luminous & lu= minated bodys continuall. And in ye eter= nity of time must surely fill up all y<sup>e</sup> vacant space in  $y^{\text{e}}$  universe, & leave no room for  $\{\underline{inane}\}$ , & what a deluge of in= cinsistencys must gappen from mhence,  $w^{\rm ch}$  I hinted at  $y^{\rm e}$  beginning? 2 All  $y^{\rm e}$ experiments in our power to try shew= light to be instantaneous; but wa/i/ve y<sup>e</sup> rigor; & if any time paSs it is so little we cannot observe it, as by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fire of cannon at two or three miles distance; How can such swift progreSsion be made thro' a compreSs Atmospher?

з.

{more}

Physica

(382)

3, but then without reflecting  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  light it self must in time fill  $y^{\rm e}$  world, they tell us of vacuitys; there cannot be much in compreSst air, & light being a body is but a slight one & subject to yield to all resistance. Then we are sent out into y<sup>e</sup> world, & there (in fullneSs of light) is all vacuity & no resistance; & it is com= puted that seven minutes is taken up in light paSsing from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun to us. PaSs all y<sup>e</sup> dubia about y<sup>e</sup> computation; what is seven minutes of time to that space? it may be answered, as to esteem or value, just nothing at all. The neceSsa= ry disorders of things, wou'd in such dis proportion, infringe even mathematical rules reduced to practise, so I must  $\operatorname{acco^t}$ this a lean pretence. Then 4. What prin= ciple of force can reside in  $y^{\rm e}$  lumina= ry, that shou'd dart these strings called rays, so Hetero=

### Physica (<del>383</del>)

so heterogene, as they say they are, as to colours i continued streams of tac= tile substances, with such incredible swiftneSs as from y<sup>e</sup> sune to us in 7 mi= nutes, & all this with out ceasing, & withall a continuall exhaustion of such matter? And y<sup>e</sup> Satellites of Jupiter whose light at greater distance have not so large an allowance of time. And what then of Saturn in his Apogee (however we forget y<sup>e</sup> fixt starrs). If any persons are inclined to credit such flights, May their joy never forsake them, while they are pleased to allow others a freedom of an= intire diSsent.

It is plain that y<sup>e</sup> great author deferred more to y<sup>e</sup> concinnity of his hypothesis, than to y<sup>e</sup> reallity of any principle, for he no where affirms that rays of light are solid or corporeall emanations from y<sup>e</sup> luminary, but only insinuates as much saying

135, Rays & pencills of rays not solid

(384)

### Physica

saying that they move quasi corpus,  $^{\rm 175}$  & ye like, wch so farr must be granted, for light & fluids are found to flux in like manner, as will appear afterwards; but  ${\tt this}$  his followers affirm downright y<sup>e</sup> perpetuall and universall emanation, so that y<sup>e</sup> matter w<sup>ch</sup> toucheth our eye, & excites ye Idea of light, was actually in y<sup>e</sup> sun about 7 minutes agone; & they have endeavoured to solve y<sup>e</sup> matter by pretending that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  corpuscles being small ad infinitum, such thredds, or pen= cills of rays (as they love to speak) poSseSs but small part of  $y^e$  space, & may paSs to & from without much interruption, & if any of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter justles, so much falls to  $y^{\rm e}$  ground, & is Lost, & yet enough always to supply our groSs sence. And this mate= tiall of light is so subtile that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  con= tent of what is in y<sup>e</sup> solar sphear col= lected wou'd be contained in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  space of a cubick

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 175}$  i.e., 'similar to body, or matter'.

a cubick inch. This is all that I have met with to palliate  $y^{e}$  monstrous o= pinion of solid rays of light; And it sa= vours strongly of y<sup>e</sup> Epicurean system  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  rests upon  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  like subterfuge of mi= nuteneSs, And for  $y^{\rm e}$  sake of a compa= rison I mentioned that before. If it is alledged; as y<sup>e</sup> mode of some is, that it is impoSsible light shoud be solved any other way, I answer first, that no argu= ments flow from ignorance; Next, that as it seems, a fair solution of light may be given, consonant to y<sup>e</sup> energy of body, & ye state of ye universe; And I am about to make  $y^{\rm e}$  same appear, & have touched this last scheme of ye mo= dernes, to remove a prejudice; for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ prepoSseSsion in favour of it, derived from  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  transcendant abillitys of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  author (In Geometry at least) is so violent that nothing (386)

nothing of a different genius must appear till that be removed; And whither I succeed or not,  $y^e$  very attempt to adprint vance a naturall knowledge is not illaudible. I wish that our moderns wou'd consider better  $y^e$  nature of principles {<u>than</u>} than to talk of particles of light, parpeticles of fire, & particles attractive, of w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> summa totalis is, Nihil,<sup>176</sup> & why not particles of sound, particles of pain, particles of pleasure, Justice, & summum bonum,<sup>177</sup> or any other metaphysicall enpetities; & all with y<sup>e</sup> same measure of science.

There is some resemblance between y<sup>e</sup> conveyances of sound & light, from re= mote objects to y<sup>e</sup> organs of our sence, both are advanced by y<sup>e</sup> interposition of y<sup>e</sup> same common medium, y<sup>e</sup> air; light appears to be in instante,<sup>178</sup> but sound in time

{\_}}

136. Of medi= ums y<sup>e</sup> more sub= tile of light & y<sup>e</sup> more groSs of sound.

<sup>178</sup> i.e., 'immediate'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>176</sup> i.e., 'the sum total of which is nothing'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>177</sup> i.e., 'the highest good'.

in time, considerably slow. And both these influences never affect ye same organ, for light is perceived by a materiall touch of a force wonderfully subtile  $w^{\rm ch}$  paSseth thro  $y^{\rm e}$  tunicks of  $y^{\rm e}$  eye,  $^{179}$  & no leSs wonderfully affects only  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  pointed extremitys of  $y^e$  optick nerve, in a man-ner augmented by refractions, as will ap= pear. And y<sup>e</sup> same matter, if y<sup>e</sup> artifice of y<sup>e</sup> eye were away, woud penetrate all y<sup>e</sup> ordinary flesh & membranes of  $y^{e}$  body, without exciting any sensati= on; But sound penetrates or paSseth through no part of ye body, but is eve= ry where stopp ted, & if violent is per= ceived by a sort of heave, as when a cannon is fired: And preSsing thro ye tube of y<sup>e</sup> ear meets woth a membrane. the tuggs of w<sup>ch</sup> excites a sence of sound, & hath no effect at all upon ye interior organ of sight; from whence I conclude That y<sup>e</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>179</sup> The eye was described as having three '*tunica*' or tunics - the external, 'fibrous tunic' (cornea, etc.), the middle, 'vascular tunic' (iris, etc.) and the internal 'nervous tunic" (the retina). In the tradition following Galen (especially in the Arabic tradition), the eye (and indeed the human body) came to be described with a complex and an evocative poetry of metaphors, still available to anyone who is bothered to look up, say, the etymology of 'retina' or 'iris'.

(388) Physica

that y° proper medium of sound is y° groSs air w<sup>ch</sup> we breath, & will be con sidered elsewhere, but y° medium of light is some order or measure of y° subtile interstitiall matter w<sup>ch</sup> is found to permeate all our compound solids, & is every where intermixt with y° air. And considering that (air) is a compreSst fluid & confined to y° limits of y° Atmos= phear, there is reason to think that /y° matter at large in y° world to be of y° more subtile sort, at least that by w<sup>ch</sup> light is conveyed, is so, & w<sup>ch</sup> every where permeates y° interstitia of it.

But it is found that as well in y<sup>e</sup> paS= sage of sound as of light, y<sup>e</sup> influence, however multiplyed & directed, paSs croSs each other all manner of ways without disorder or confusion; w<sup>ch</sup> wou'd be more admired, if y<sup>e</sup> circlings upon water did not shew y<sup>e</sup> like distinctly, but that

137. A groSs image re= presenting y<sup>e</sup> united cause of sound & light.

that reconciles  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  common experience we have in cases analogous, but leSs distinctly as by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ordinary use of our senses. How this makes it neceSsary to distinguish y<sup>e</sup> actions of light & sound,  $y^{\rm e}$  latter is to be dropt, &  $y^{\rm e}$  present speculation confined to ye former. And this is not to be done but in y<sup>e</sup> Cartesian method ny contriving some ordinary image to referr to. And that here shall be a large pool of wa= ter; let  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  labourer come with his spade flatt, & strike a smart stroke with it upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  surface of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water. Here are 2 influences of very different effects, one of circling waves spreading gra= dually upon  $y^{\rm e}$  surface,  $w^{\rm ch}$  represent sound;  $y^{\text{e}}$  other of an impulse eodem <code>instante^{180</code> upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  whole body of  $y^{\text{e}}$  water,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  wou'd be perceived accordingly by animalls having senses sufficiently subtile for it. And this resembles

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>180</sup> i.e., 'at the very same moment'.

(390)

### Physica

rese/e\mbles  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  action of light. How these strokes may be reiterated, broken, multiplyed & diversifyed, &  $y^{\rm e}$  animalls affected there= with; will be considered & referred to after= wards. But at present we have here an Image of  $y^{\rm e}$  action & our sence of light,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is like  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  animalls perception of those strokes; & y<sup>e</sup> minuteneSs of such impul= ses, will appear to be no objection, so long as they are any thing; &  $y^{\rm e}$  consequen= ces of all motive impulses are infinite, as our theory of motion hath demonstra= ted. It is to be added here that  $y^e$  percep= tion of these animalls is not of a pro= pension, but of a reall loco-motion, to w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> organick substance of their bo= dys yields, & a quick iteration of  $y^{\rm e}$ strokes amounts to a continuation, as light seems continued by an interrup= ted succeSsion of pulses upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  optic nerve. Now

169r

(138)

pulses of
y<sup>e</sup> sun's
fiery parts
y<sup>e</sup> cause
of light

# Physica (<del>391</del>) 169

Now we must consider  $y^{\rm e}$  luminarys, & collate them with y<sup>e</sup> foregoing scheme, & for this purpose I shall select y<sup>e</sup> most worthy  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is  $y^e$  sun. We presume that to be planted in  $y^e$  center of a large At= mosphear consisting of groSser matter, as that about  $y^{\rm e}$  earth,  $w^{\rm ch}$  by a (solar) gravity continually preSseth upon its surface. And ye body of ye sun being apparently a body of fire, ye parts of w<sup>ch</sup> are always in a violent agitation, & those at  $y^{\rm e}$  surface, continually strike against  $y^{\text{e}}$  adjoyning Atmosphear,  $w^{\text{ch}}$ affect  $y^e$  contiguous parts, & those others, & so by  $y^{\rm e}$  plenitude of  $y^{\rm e}$  world, or per= petuall contiguity of matter, Each particular pulse extends an influence to all distance; even as farr as wou'd re= duce y<sup>e</sup> suns apparent magnitude down to that of a fixt starr. And I must also affirm (392) Physica

affirm that all those pulses ac= tually move y<sup>e</sup> infinity of matter in y<sup>e</sup> world, & being combined is that action that inspirits y<sup>e</sup> universe with a tremo= lous agitation, w<sup>ch</sup> resented at our op= ticks, excites in our minds, y<sup>e</sup> glorious Idea of an universall light. I know that here I run a risq of being accoun= ted madd, what; y<sup>e</sup> pulse of an imper= cetible particle at y<sup>e</sup> surface of y<sup>e</sup> sun inspire a perceptible action in y<sup>e</sup> whole universe? therefore, as they say, I desire to be heard, not doubting to shew that, all things considered, what I advance is y<sup>e</sup> very truth of y<sup>e</sup> matter.

First I observe, that /but\ not with much re= lyance, that, sence, as action, amy be sub= tile ad infinitum, & y<sup>e</sup> capacity of sight (as y<sup>e</sup> exillity of matter & motion) is unlimi= ted. And in favour of it, y<sup>e</sup> organ is guarded & con-

139 The subtilety of sence & power of minute a= gents with instances

## Physica (<del>393</del>) 170

& conserved in perpetuall humidity, so that we have no means of perceiving so nice as by sight. But this compared with y<sup>e</sup> magnitudes abroad is but a pe= tite circumstance. Next I respect conjun= ction of forces.It is plain that many mi= nute agents of w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> powers act in y<sup>e</sup> same tendency, unite in Grand effects,  $w^{ch}$  is de= monstrated by a common instance in me= chanicks, as when 2. bodys of equall force Impell a greater third; that shall receive a stronger impreSsion than singly either of them wou'd have given. So (to use  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ former instance) ye light of a candle being stated to be just seen at a certain dis= tance; if another like candle is sett near it,  $y^e$  light will be visibly magnifyed, & so more like, to a great augmentation, of w<sup>ch</sup>  $y^e$  strength is but as that of a single  $\{\underline{straw}\},$ but y<sup>e</sup> conjunction of many acting upon y<sup>e</sup> same

{\_}

(394)

### Physica

same substance augments  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  force. where= by out of weak causes combined, vio= lent effects proceed. And since such out of-y<sup>e</sup>-way truths as we have in hand must be persued thro' more familiar Images, before we can come at a direct credit, I shall produce a few more to y<sup>e</sup> same purpose. Take a single straw (as was before instanced) & light it, it will burn with a flame an inch long; but if you light a large heap of straw, when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole hath taken fire, it shall mount in a pyramidall flame as high as an house, & all this consists but of single straws inflamed. All kinds of explosions may be instances of this phaenomenon, but I will select one w<sup>ch</sup> is more ad rem.<sup>181</sup> We know that y<sup>e</sup> sunns light upon a small particle or misty drop of water is but a speck of light, & scarce

## Physica (<del>395</del>) 171

scarce, or rather not perceivable at all. Yet a maSsy cloud that after a storm is exposed to y<sup>e</sup> sun consisting only of such misty dropps, severally insensible, yet in union shall shine as strong as (almost) sun it self; after this flagrant instance, I think I need produce no more to shew that extream exillity of force in parti= culars, by multitudes cooperating are magnifyed in y<sup>e</sup> effect to any degree. And if on y<sup>e</sup> one side y<sup>e</sup> progreSsion decreaseth towards infinite exillity, on y<sup>e</sup> other give we an arbitrary increase of numbers oppo= sed y<sup>e</sup> result shall surmount ad libitum, datum eum dato.<sup>182</sup>

After this it cannot seem strange that y<sup>e</sup> light of y<sup>e</sup> sun altho consisting only of a continuall tremulation of y<sup>e</sup> whole Aether caused by y<sup>e</sup> impulses of y<sup>e</sup> subtile matter of fire upon it, shou'd be so fierce. Because taking

140. The notion explained & y<sup>e</sup> appli= cation.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 182}$  i.e., 'freely, according to the given circumstances'.

(396.) Physica

taking  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  diameter of it to exceed that of y<sup>e</sup> earth as they compute 100,000 times, &  $y^e$  fire more violent than (perhapps) we can conceive. ±In this account ye num= ber of /ye\ minute pulses shall overballance  $y^{\text{e}}$  exility of  $y^{\text{e}}$  particulars, & inspirit  $y^{\text{e}}$ whole Aether, & signally at our distance, So that having apt organs of sight, we are in admiration at ye light of ye sun, & may not wonder that ye barbarians thought it  $y^{\text{e}}$  God of  $y^{\text{e}}$  world. We have now to consider how this notion agrees with  $y^e$  phaenomenon; & first, here being a reall tho tremolous motion of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  whole Aether, derived from every point of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ sunn's Surface, to every point in ye Aether, making impreSsion upon tender things: The effects must be regulated in y<sup>e</sup> same manner, as if  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Aether moved not tremolous, but currently. And  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  seeming proceSs, Physica (<del>397</del>) 172

proceSs of light will conform to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  common rules of fluid streams, w<sup>ch</sup> is proved by y<sup>e</sup> consequences in reflexction, Refraction &c. as will be further observed. There is but one law  $w^{\rm ch}$  rules all impulsive ac= tion of atter, whither progreSsive or Tremolous. As in y<sup>e</sup> instance of y<sup>e</sup> spade. If  $y^e$  water were quiet & unconfined, then as y<sup>e</sup> substance of it being free wou'd actually have moved from y<sup>e</sup> [stroke?]stroke {\_\_} every way; so y<sup>e</sup> influence of y<sup>e</sup> stroke, is to be accounted. And it is really  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ same thing; for where way is made, or things, (as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Organs of animalls) take impreSsion, so actuall motion succeeds, & not otherwise. And this is t be aesti= mated as at  $y^e$  first { <code>sta/r?\te</code>} of  $y^e$  motion, as supposing an obstacle immerst in  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  there was a foramen,  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  influence of y<sup>e</sup> spade

{<u>by right</u> <u>lines</u>}

{\_}}

(398) Physica

 $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  spade,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{ch}$  paSseth by direct lines, woud not turn about  $y^{\text{e}}$  objectstacle,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  covers  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fluid according to its extent, but it woud paSs /directly\ thro  $y^{\rm e}$  foramen to  $y^{\rm e}$  ut= most extent. What is it else, when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$ sun shines, & a screne interposeth ha= ving an hole in it; y<sup>e</sup> light is shaded except against that hole, thro w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> influence (that is  $y^e$  tremolous light) paSseth in directum, & it is observable that when a fluid is strongly urged, to paSs against a foraminated obstacle, altho y<sup>e</sup> direction is strait, y<sup>e</sup> edges by rea= son of  $y^{\rm e}$  common irregularity of mi= nute parts will be ragged, & intermix or swerve a little; so  $y^{\rm e}$  light falling upon an opposite plane will shew  $y^{\rm e}$ like, for angles will appear rou{nded}, & triangles & squares circular or ovall, & no

{\_}

& no edges justly terminated. And when y<sup>e</sup> influence is tremolous, that is by conti= nual starts, all y<sup>e</sup> rules of impulse & action take place, therefore it is justly affirmed that altho light is not com= posed of heterogene substances, yet all its results are according to y<sup>e</sup> laws of substance. Nor doth it inferr that light is really progreSsive, because it hath some analogous effects, for those attend indifferently as well a tremolous action, as a progreSsive, for therey are quasi y<sup>e</sup> same, & y<sup>e</sup> argument from y<sup>e</sup> skre{<u>en in</u>} y<sup>e</sup> optica<sup>183</sup> hath nor fo/r\ce to y<sup>e</sup> contrary.

141. Light is meer touch, {<u>are}</u> & colours y<sup>e</sup> modifi= cations, in y<sup>e</sup> eye not in y<sup>e</sup>

object

{<u>at first</u>}

Now as to our sense of light, it is induced by  $y^e$  like means as all other sensations whatsoeve{ $\underline{r \ \&}$ } that is pure touch, where= by  $y^e$  parts of  $y^e$  organ are more or leSs, or in one manner or other actu=/ally\ moved

 $<sup>^{183}</sup>$  This refers to Newton's description in the *Opticks* of light, having passed through a hole of whatever shape in a screen, when projected onto a surface, tends to be rounded which Newton used to argue for his particle theory of light (*see* p. 216 in 1718 edition)

moved. And  $y^{\rm e}$  Ideas are not in  $y^{\rm e}$  ma= {<u>wch</u> touches?} teriall {tangent}, but in our imagi= nations only. To instance (in com= mon apprehension) pain is not in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$ sword, saw, or fire that torments, but in  $y^{\rm e}$  mind or imagination, of  $y^{\rm e}$  ani= mall tormented. Therefore it is vain to say that light, is in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun or any luminary, or that (in form) it proceeds from thence, for any manner of touch upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  optick nerve, gives  $y^{\text{e}}$  sence of light, & some diversifications of it, colours; As a finger touching one cor= ner of y<sup>e</sup> eye, excites a lumen (seemingly) at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  opposite; So a rude fist of one clown upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  visage of another, (as they say) makes fire fly out of their eyes, & so hard vomitings, &  $y^{\rm e}$  like. Where are here to be found  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  adventitious rays & pencills of rays of Heterogene

Physica

(3400)

substances

Physica (401) 174

substances commixt in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  body of light, as y<sup>e</sup> Newtonian hypothesis presumes. Now as to  $y^{\rm e}$  varietys of colours in gene= rall, there is no more to be sayd, but that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  modes of pulsation upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  eye may be as copiously diversfyed as any changes we can perceive by means of light. And why not blew, redd, or green, be as well derived from various tremo= lous touches upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  eye, as unisons, thirds & fifths, from  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  various vibrations of musicall instruments? But I must ob= serve that no reason is to be asked or given for specifick sensations; but each is in  $y^{\text{e}}\xspace$  mind, as form or shape is pecu= liar to bodys. None can ask  $\underline{y}^{e} why \ y^{e}$  sence called  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  head ache, is not  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  same as that called  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  heart ache or  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  contra. So no one can say why  $y^{\rm e}$  sence of one action shoud represent to  $y^{\rm e}$  sight blew & not redd

(402) Physica

redd. This puzzled Cartesius, who thought he knew & cou'd resolve every thing, & at last he was forc't to referr it to y<sup>e</sup> Almighty's will that it shou'd be so, that is that y<sup>e</sup> cause that exhibites redd, shou'd not be efficient as well for blew, or any other colour. But here it is enough, whether blew, redd, or green, neither one or other is found in y<sup>e</sup> object, but is a creature of imagina= tion; w<sup>ch</sup> so understood as I take y<sup>e</sup> meer truth to be, diSsolves y<sup>e</sup> whole scheme of y<sup>e</sup> optica as to y<sup>e</sup> physicall part, w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Newtonians of late do most furi= ously hold forth.

As to other propertys of light, a word or two further; first, that objectively it is rectilinear, & never Arcuate (Ex= cepting as afterwards), & that rectili= nearity must terminate in y<sup>e</sup> luminous

or luminated

or luminated body, & thereby  $y^{\rm e}$  artifice of  $y^{\rm e}$  eye directs  $y^{\rm e}$  sight, & this action for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  porpose in hand may resemble gravity w<sup>ch</sup> is always estimated by right lines directed from  $y^e$  center, differing chiefly in to & from{ $\{\underline{/\,}\}}.$  Next,  $y^e$  action of light, tho' from infinite resources, croSsing & recroSsing continually, cre= ate no confusion, & are not reciprocal= ly obstructive, but with this exception only, that, as to sence,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  greater absorp ye leSser, as greater magnitudes cover leSser, or as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  gliSsening of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  sky hinders ye sight of starrs by day light. This ir= reluctable perseverance of light paS= sing from & to all places, & in all direc= tions is a stupendious property &  $y^{\rm e}$  whole use of light in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  world depends upon it. And it is so much more to be admired, as it is considered, that y<sup>e</sup> action it self, commu=

{for thro ..
yniforme &c?}

## (404) Physica

communicates no distinct images of any thing; for a simple organ capable of exciting a sence by y<sup>e</sup> touch of light, is displayed & deprived of its artifices, that is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  refractions, wou'd communicate no shapes or distinctions of any thing, & so light is in  $y^{\rm e}$  world at large, a con= fused action, Like that of gravitation of a fluid. In w<sup>ch</sup> an animall may per= ceive a preSsure from a ship under sail, but no form of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  veSsell: And consequently  $y^{\rm e}$  world hath not that or= nament by light as commonly is con= ceived: For that wonderfull consequence of refractions thro angular/ar/ or arcu= ated forms of glaSs,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  latter reduce  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$ action to a distinct base (as it is termed) is  $y^{\rm e}$  only instructor of  $y^{\rm e}$  forms, & termi= nations of all visibles, &  $y^{\rm e}$  humours or membranes of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  eye are as those glaSses, without

<red BM stamp>

without  $w^{\rm ch}$  all lumen wou'd be as a mist, &  $y^{\rm e}$ luminary it self without shape as when folks look against ye sun with their eyes shut; this is a profound truth, tho' little considered, when men lookk about them & admire  $y^{\rm e}$  glory of y<sup>e</sup> universe; I do not say a wonderfull lustre of things! but a wonderfull operations of sence; that from y<sup>e</sup> agitations of meer matter, conducted by  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  single but universall law of mechanicks, shall derive those illus= trious, usefull, & delightfull Ideas, as we enjoy by vision. Some may think that I here supplant one of y<sup>e</sup> chief philoso= phick proofs of a deity, that is  $y^e$  beauty & order of  $y^{\rm e}$  world; but it seems to me rather exalted; we allow ye order to ye world, but what wee call  $\bar{y^{\rm e}}$  image & beau= ty of it is referred wholly to ye mind of man. Then consider what incompre= hensible wisdom is eclatant in this dis= position? I may perhaps undertake thereby to prove

143.) Difform mediums deprive or refract y<sup>e</sup> rectitude of light. (406) Physica

to prove not only spirituallity, but  $y^e$  De= ity it self with more force than hath been done by any philosophick argument yet; But of this in another design.

Now to return to our subject ye naturall operation, & effect of light;  $y^{\text{e}}$  curiousity of it is such; that I cannot part without some further altercation, tending to clarify it to our ordinary understandings, or at least, make my notion as limpid, as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  principles in these discourses presumed, will bear. And this I shall attempt by examining w<sup>eht</sup> may, or rather must be incidentall upon this supposed action of light. If I shall call it a tremor, or perhaps (conforming with y<sup>e</sup> usuall language) Rays, y<sup>e</sup> thing, as I under= stand it, will be ye same, & that is to be al= ways reserved. It was observed that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  tremor is derived from impulses upon y<sup>e</sup> subtile mat= ter, such as we take  $y^{\rm e}$  common Aether of  $y^{\rm e}$ world to be; w<sup>ch</sup> maintains a contiguity thro  $\mathbf{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  whole

## Physica (407) 177

 $y^{\rm e}$  whole open universe; & being of an uni= form mixture,  $y^{e}$  action must disperse eve= ry way in  $y^{\text{e}}$  manner of strait lines, for how shou'd it swerve when there is nothing unequall to incline it one way or other. The groSser matter of  $y^e$  fluid world, as (for instance) y<sup>e</sup> common air we breath is influ= enced yeby ye tremor only secondarily. But while y<sup>e</sup> composition of that, as also of o= ther transparent fluids or solid substances is uniform,  $y^{\rm e}$  tremor in paSsing thro' will maintain  $y^{\rm e}$  like rectilinearity; but if  $y^{\rm e}$ composition be of groSs, difform, or uncom= pliant parts, & compact so as /that\  $y^{\rm e}$  tremor is interrupted, as this is more or leSs, so such bodys tend to opacity. But it is made a question whither there is made a place in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ whole universe perfectly dark, for  $y^{\rm e}$  sub= tile matter  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  runs thro all, will convey ye tremor in some degree. For w<sup>ch</sup> reason opacity is referred to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  tone of our sensitive facultys

(4808) Physica

facultys, w<sup>ch</sup> in y<sup>e</sup> presence of great are e= nervated as to small things, as y<sup>e</sup> starrs in y<sup>e</sup> suns light, or glissening of y<sup>e</sup> air, become imperceptible.

But in every case where  $y^{\rm e}$  tremor is con= tinued thro compositions of different tex= ture, there is some interruption, & in con= sequence a division of y<sup>e</sup> tremor, so that as is much as is resisted (in a way of opaci= ty) reflects, for  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  reason every superficies of  $y^{\rm e}$  most transparent body reflects some of  $y^{\rm e}$  light, & only  $y^{\rm e}$  rest so excised paSseth thro'; & in this conflict,  $y^{\text{e}} \; \text{dir}_{ec}/\text{ec} \text{tion}$ of  $y^{\text{e}}$  tremor,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  we they call rays, falling in any obliquity [upone?] ye plane of ye direction angular to  $y^{\rm e}$  former from  $y^{\rm e}$ point of y<sup>e</sup> transit, & this is called refrac= tion, &  $y^{\rm e}$  like happens & every exit & introit of light from & into transparent bodys of different composition; while in y<sup>e</sup> paSsage

144.

In y<sup>e</sup> con= fines of difform me= diums light both reflects & refracts.

### Physica

(<del>409</del>) 178

y<sup>e</sup> paSsage thro each substance (uniform= ly composed,) between y<sup>e</sup> superficies, y<sup>e</sup> rays are strait. But this of an excep= tion w<sup>ch</sup> falls out to be when y<sup>e</sup> mediums are not parted by an abrupt superficies, but gradually changing, as we suppose to be between y<sup>e</sup> Aether & y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear, because y<sup>e</sup> latter gradually condenseth from Aetheriall purity to y<sup>e</sup> density of y<sup>e</sup> common air we breath, therefore y<sup>e</sup> light of any celestiall luminary, falling obliquely upon y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear, doth not refract angularly, but arcuatim,<sup>184</sup> as y<sup>e</sup> Astronomers well know & declare.

Now to postpone y<sup>e</sup> consequences of reflec= tion, we will first consider y<sup>e</sup> events of that lumen w<sup>ch</sup> paSseth refracted. The angle of y<sup>e</sup> refraction, made by figurated GlaSses is managed so artificially that y<sup>e</sup> light shall converge or diverge almost ad

libitum<sup>185</sup>

148. Of refrac= tion, con= vergences, & universall indistinction in light.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>184</sup> i.e., 'in the form of a bow or arch'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>185</sup> i.e., 'in any way whatever (or: in whatever way you like)'.

(410) Physica

libitum. And considering that light from any luminous point spreads everyway, A glaSs they call a lens convex hath such effect, that all y<sup>e</sup> rays from any point, paSsing  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{ass}}\xspaces$  of the suremath{\mathsf{sol}}\xspace where  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{sol}}\xspace$  suremath{\mathsf{ass}}\xspace face of  $y^{\rm e}\ {\tt glaSs}\,,$  shall by refraction converge & centrate in some one point upon a plane they call  $ay^e$  distinct base, & upon that mark out or represent y<sup>e</sup> place of that point; & then taking  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole space without, to be or to consist of luminous points radiating every way  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm place}\ {\rm of}$ each is mar/r\ked upon y<sup>e</sup> distinct base, & by this means  $y^{\rm e}$  shapes of all things Resi= dent in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  space before  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  glaSs, with every circumstance of colour, motion, & pro= portion and described by touch upon this plain & distinct base, w<sup>ch</sup> is demonstrated by  $y^e$  experiment of  $y^e$  camera obscura. And as this is done by y<sup>e</sup> means of human sagacity
## Physica (411) 179

sagacity,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  like is providentially settled in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ eyes of men & animalls,  $w^{\rm ch}$  consist of fluids transparent, & so conformed, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  light from every thing without, point by point, converging, touch ye optick nerve or sen= sible point called  $y^e$  retina, & so (as upon a distinct base.) describe  $y^e$  images of all things externally objected, & thereby vision (as all other modes of perception) appears plainly to be an effect of pure materi= all touch, & not otherwise. And it appears also that besides these precise convergen= ces, & topicall projection of objects in finitely croSsing, & in  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  each point filling (as it were)  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  whole foramen of  $y^e$  eye, & reduced to points again, whereby ye forms of things without, are mapped in proportion upon y<sup>e</sup> retina or (as in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  camera obscura) there is no flowing distinction of forms, termina tions & dimensions of any thing abroad in y<sup>e</sup>

(412) Physica

in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole universe, but whatever influen= ces proceed by way of lumen, they are all blended & confounded together. As for exam= ple, if a cartoon is presented afore  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun or any maSs of luminous objects, ye effi= cacy of  $y^{\text{e}}$  light will fall upon it, but it is upon all parts alike. And nothing de termines  $y^{\text{e}}$  form of  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun, or resembles any thing from whence ye influence ar= rives. And while it is a common notion in opticks touched upon before, that each luminous point influenceth (for so it is seen) every way, y<sup>e</sup> lumen from all points perpetually croSseth, so that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole (as I sayd) must be a confusion, & what is most wonderfull is to consider, that y<sup>e</sup> lumen from every point of an exteri= or view at y<sup>e</sup> same time fills (as I may say)  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole formamen of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  eye, before it is segregated again & reduced to ana= logary/ous\ points upon y<sup>e</sup> retina, by conver/ging\ as was

Physica (413) 180

as was expreSsed. And this, I think, is demon= stration enough, that rays cannot be ma= teriall, or transient emanations. I cannot therefore sufficiently expreSs y<sup>e</sup> inconsis= tency, I might say contradiction wrapt in y<sup>e</sup> proposition, that light contains really any thing, besides y<sup>e</sup> substance of y<sup>e</sup> medium, y<sup>e</sup> modes of w<sup>ch</sup> only as of sound, affect our senses with such known varietys.

I must precaution here, that y<sup>e</sup> first prin= ciples of y<sup>e</sup> optick science are no secrets, else, it is scarce poSsible in these matters to discourse so as to be understood; And al= tho my aim is wholly physicall, I must ne= ceSsarily trench upon arts, to reduce y<sup>e</sup> subject to terms of certainty, but a small advance will be sufficient. Now we come to other consequences of refraction, besides configu= ration or order, & those are y<sup>e</sup> various brillant colorations, w<sup>ch</sup> are found to be produced thereby: & are

146, Refrac= tions shew colours, but not singly, & all but modes of touch

Physica

414

& are become  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  subject of much criti= cism. I paSs,  $y^e$  hypothesis, /&\ experiments in y<sup>e</sup> optica, having touched upon them al ready; & again affirm that colours, like all other Ideas of our perception, are in  $y^{\rm e}$  imagination, & not in  $y^{\rm e}$  object. The ma= teriall as it is applyed may occasion va= rious Ideas, & so materiall rays (if any such were) by way of contact might occasion Ideas of colour, but not be in themselves coloured. But  $y^e$  sence or Idea of colour proceeds from  $y^e$  modes of  $y^e$  touch inflic= ted upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  organ by  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  action or tremor called light, & may be diversifyed as our sence represents varietys, especially in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ transition of light between mediums of different compositions. This I think will not be doubted, & first of a refraction by one plane superficies, as when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  light paSeth obliq thro level water; I have not

Physica (4<del>15</del>) 181

not observed colours at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  bottom, so an oar or staff refracted doth not shew colours, no more than a piece of mony thro  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water in a bason; but if y<sup>e</sup> surface of y<sup>e</sup> water be arcuated as by {waves} then colours plen= ty are seen from  $y^{\rm e}$  bottom. All  $w^{\rm ch}$  shew that such transits as most [....?] disturb y<sup>e</sup> course of light Exhibite most colours. If ye doc= trine of gradually refrangibillity hold, how comes it that common objects seen thro  $y^{\text{e}}$  many refractions in  $y^{\text{e}}$  eye, are not colour'd? And so divers other instances may be given of like consequence; we find no colours attend  $y^{\text{e}}$  celestiall luminarys, as  $y^{\text{e}}$ sun, moon, & starrs tho their light falls obliq, upon y<sup>e</sup> atmosphear; And that not single but re{flect}ed,  $w^{\rm ch}$  bends them not by an angle, but by an arch, as y<sup>e</sup> astronomers declare; we find tha most colour proceeds from subjects of greatest disturbance of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  strait course of light as thro divers arcuate superfices

{\_}

{Repeated}

(416) Physica

superficies, or thorough severall inclining planes, such as prismes, of w<sup>ch</sup> forms are accomodated to shew  $y^{\rm e}$  perfection of refrac= ted colours. And I shou'd prosecute divers in= ferences from them, were not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  subject almost exhaust in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  optica. But this farr I may presume, advising y<sup>e</sup> curious to take up a prism, & turn it afore their eyes against a light window [shaSsed?], & then to observe what is obvious. And that will be, that  $y^{\rm e}$  colorations are but  ${\tt symp}{\tt =}$ tomes, not of any regular order, as fillets \*X\*<sup>186</sup> of colours one by another, but of con= fusion & disorder. For  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  colours are at  $y^{\rm e}$  edges of  $y^{\rm e}$  opaques, & not only of  $y^{\rm e}$ {trans}verses, but of y<sup>e</sup> uprights as full & strongly, w<sup>ch</sup> coud not be if y<sup>e</sup> refran= gibillitys run one way. And each opag is seen almost merged in colour, if one side is  $\underline{bules}/blues \backslash$  ,  $y^e$  other side is redds perpe= tually, those two not coming any where

near

{<u>trans-</u>}

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>186</sup> See note on following page.

near together so as to intermix,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is a wonderfull mistery; & as to ye fundamen= tall observation that a refracted colour, will not vary upon any further refrac= tion,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  inference is but ignorance; we know not why, Ergo Rays & refrangibil= litys. But to leave these matter to ye curious, we affirm only that colours proceed from divers & not single refracti= ons. And such is  $y^e$  case of  $y^e$  rain bow, & ye morning dew. Des Cartes shews how ye lumen both enters  $y^{\rm e}$  drop, & exit with refraction, but between both, reflects from  $y^{\rm e}$  interior superficies & so altoge= ther colour strongly,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  I must ascribe to y<sup>e</sup> curvity of y<sup>e</sup> superficies every way disturbing ye lumen. And to conclude, some transparent bodys colour much more than others, as Diamants more than crystall, of  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$   $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  cause, till we have ultra Lincean

\*X\*<sup>187</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>187</sup> In the gutter, in pencil, a star-like image formed in the fold by a horizontal line, with two 45° lines, one above and one below the horizontal, as if describing the angle of incidence and reflection on a reflective surface. The image is very small, hardly an illustration or diagram, more likely a doodle related to the discussion of Descartes description of the light refracted in the rain/dew drop.

(418) Physica

Lyncean<sup>188</sup> facultys will never be made appear to our understandings.

Hitherto of light transient, next, of light reflected, of w<sup>ch</sup> it is observed first that however  $y^e$  light is affected or colou= red, it suffers no alteration by pure re= flexion, but a clear or coloured lumen so reflected is still ye same. And whatever succeeds upon refraction, so much of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ lumen as will be reflected (w<sup>ch</sup> is not a small share) is y<sup>e</sup> same as it was at y<sup>e</sup> touch. I said a just reflection, that is from a plain superficies, w<sup>ch</sup> diverts all  $y^{\text{e}}$  light in  $y^{\text{e}}$  same order & manner as it came, & is  $y^e$  case of polisht mettalls & looking glaSses, for so, it is but as other materiall reflexions, a continuation of y<sup>e</sup> prior action in all y<sup>e</sup> modes, saving only ye direction. Originall light it self may be tincted, as when we say corusca/tions\ are

147. Specular reflexions do not alter but from rough superfices all colour & distinc= tion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>188</sup> i.e., eyes 'like a Lynx', or 'like Lynceus'. Lynceus was a companion of Jason on the Argos, reputed to have the ability to see through solid objects. His name is derived from the Greek word for 'sight', as is the name of the Lynx. The title page of Hooke's *Micrographia* bore a quotation from Horace's first epistle that would have been familiar to contemporaries: 'Non possis oculo quantum contendere Linceus, Non tamen idcirco contemnas Lippus inungi' ('Your eyes will never see like Lynceus'; still//You rub them with an ointment when they're ill.' trans. John Conington MA (1869), Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. Project Gutenberg. Retrieved 10 August, 2013.) Eyesight is is the most privileged tool of early-modern science and is celebrated and referred to repeatedly during this period, from the choice of the name of the Roman Accademia dei Lincei in 1603, to Hooke's dictum: "with a sincere hand and a faithful eye".

Physica (419) 183

are' redd, or a candle burns blew,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{ch}$  is from y<sup>e</sup> various modes of y<sup>e</sup> luminous action, or when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  medium is such, as shall affect  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  action of light, so that being clear, yet thro coloured glaSs shall become blue or redd. I do but touch upon these instances to lay them aside, for all such varietys will be accounted for under y<sup>e</sup> common consideration of co= loured objects,  $w^{\rm ch}$  are continually ob= servable. And of these we have nothing to do; but with  $y^{\rm e}$  superficies, & those differ from specular surfaces, by con= sisting of parts of irregular forms & positions, so that light reflecting from them is confused & so sent every way. The speculars are seen only in y<sup>e</sup> course, or angle of y<sup>e</sup> reflection, but these are seen from all positions. This whole matter is so obvious to our imagination as needs (420) Physica

as needs no exaggeration; And it is no leSs familiar to conceive; And it is no leSs familiar to conceive, that light from su= perficies of contingent or irregular posi= tions, or shapes, must differ one from  $y^{\rm e}$ other & those differences by  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  we distin= guish things, we call colour;  $An\{\frac{d}{y^e} \setminus use of\}$ such differences, whereby ye various ob jects of y<sup>e</sup> universe, falling in view, are terminated, Experimented, & known, & all by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  means of those petite convergencys in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  eye, while confusion takes place without, is admirable, & a demonstrati= on of a wisdom superior to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  materiall world. It may be expected I shoud take notice of a conceipt that reflected angles are curves & not rectilinear angles, but finding no ground for such a fancy, I leave it intire for those that delight in such raritys.

{\_}}

184r

149. Light in= creased, di minisht, or distur= bed & of burning

Light may be increased or diminished,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$ former only by convergencys, either from convex or concave bodys, nicely polished. It is no wonder that y<sup>e</sup> action of a larger space brought to bear in one more contracted, shou'd urge more violently. As water forced into a tunnell shaped pipe, must move swifter & with more force in y<sup>e</sup> smaller than in y<sup>e</sup> wider space. And y<sup>e</sup> groSs air being ob= noxious to  $y^{\text{e}}$  insults of  $y^{\text{e}}$  subtile matter by  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}\ y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  suns light acts, when it is much contracted a culinary fire is excited by  $y^{\text{e}}$  violence of  $y^{\text{e}}$  agitation, all  $y^e$  is but  $y^e$  agitation /effect of multipli= cation, & when y<sup>e</sup> spaces from whence  $y^{\text{e}}$  action is derived, as from  $y^{\text{e}}$  whole ex tent of  $y^e$  concave, to  $y^e$  space of 1/4 inch, are calculated & compared,  $y^{\rm e}$  effect of  $\underline{\mathbf{y}}^e\text{that}$  combustion collated with  $y^e$  ordinary heat

## (422) Physica

heat of  $y^e$  sun will not be thought ex= ceSsive. Setting these convergencys aside, light can have no increase, but may be diminish't by many ways, & one is with= out change of condition or colour, by debillity of reflexion, as when a tennis ball is struck against a matt, y<sup>e</sup> reflection is little. And so it is upon a privation of light, w<sup>ch</sup> we call black, And is most found in things macera= ted or honycombed by fire, as charcoal, or  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  like, But this privation is never perfect, for light in some measure is allways reflected, w<sup>ch</sup> painters are a= ware of. Light is strongest from bo= dys called white, & that consists of parts that reflect pure light; & black substances w<sup>ch</sup> at certein views shine, being broken into powder become white because a speck of pure light is reflec/ted\ from

from each granule & on that account snow, & all sorts of froth, are milk white, That  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  we call shining is only a degree, as of  $y^e$  luminary, Especially  $y^e$  chief, but common objects, tho white or co= loured, are not said to shine but when seen out of darkneSs as some clouds, y<sup>e</sup> moon, or a steeple shined upon in y<sup>e</sup> e= vening. Light upon common coloured objects allways looseth a portion, & that more or leSs is an ingredient in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  colou ration; but that (colouration) is mostly derived from y<sup>e</sup> confused mode of y<sup>e</sup> re= flexion of  $y^{\text{e}}$  surfaces,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  being alike are called of  $y^{\rm e}$  same colour of  $w^{\rm ch}$  there are always degrees, & those in order are cal= led shades, & what ever  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  shades of colours are they terminate in y<sup>e</sup> same extreams of black & white. And even those as

well

(424) Physica

well as intermediates have dependance on  $y^e$  mode of  $y^e$  reflexion, for there is a lively black, & also a faint white  $w^{ch}$  are of  $y^e$  same hew whither  $y^e$  light be strong or weak.

Of y<sup>e</sup> intermediates, y<sup>e</sup> author of y<sup>e</sup> opti= ca hath advanced a distinction that is of originall colours, supposed to be simple eror unmixed, & those that are compound of y<sup>e</sup> former; as there is an originall blew, & a blew made by black, yellow & green powders ground together & y<sup>e</sup> eye cannot tell w<sup>ch</sup> is w<sup>ch</sup>, but yet a micros/s\cope will distinguish y<sup>e</sup> several granules in their proper co= lours; And I say that if we had mi= croscopes of centuple y<sup>e</sup> capacity of magnifying, we might discern y<sup>e</sup> mi nute composition of originall blew

& also

149 The dis= tinction of originall & compound colours vain.

#### Physica

& also all  $y^{\rm e}$  severall modes of superfi= cies that produce  $y^e$  images of colours in our sence. It is certain that minutes in mixture, (as when sence cannot distinguish) produce Ideas that are not in  $y^{\rm e}$  object; as Harmony from pure pulsation, & so colours from mix't & confused reflexions; &  $y^{\rm e}$  great author was aware of this when he fancyed there might be some alliance between colours & Harmony; but his reason I think was extraordinary, for he fan= cyed that colours were disposed by inter= valls as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fretts of a base violl. But now to take leave of this subject of colours whither from mixt reflections, or different refrangibillity of rays as they seemed ranged by a prism; I shall only observe that light (from a shopwin/dow\) colours

150. Distur= bance & obstruction ingender colours (426) Physica

colours so as by a sort of spreading they cover  $y^e$  opac;  $w^{ch}$  cou'd not be if laid side against side by refrangibillity.

I shall close this tumultuous eSsay of light & colours with observing, that conterminations or junctures of diffe= rent substances are allways ragged or disordered & never as by a strait joint, but perplexly interfering or indentated; w<sup>ch</sup> may be observed in liquors of diffe= rent weight & colours  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  (as they say) shade into one and other, without commixing intirely. And an instance no leSs familiar is that of an half=roast'd apple, w<sup>ch</sup> cutt thro, shall shew in y<sup>e</sup> con= fines of  $y^{\rm e}$  hot & cold parts a circule quasi coloured, w<sup>ch</sup> must put one in mind of a rain bow, Halo or  $y^{\rm e}$  cir= clings about  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parhelia. Considering therefore that colours from refraction

always

#### Physica

(<del>3</del>427) 187

always cleave close to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  contermination or  $y^{\rm e}$  opaques where  $y^{\rm e}$  course of  $y^{\rm e}$  lu= minous action is first disordered,  $\ensuremath{\&}$  that in no case y<sup>e</sup> whole space is coloured, it seems sufficient to persuade one that colour is but  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  effect of disorder in paSsing from one medium into another, as  $y^{\rm e}$  raggs & indents of all such junctures, w<sup>ch</sup> create in us images we call colour. I know that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  author of  $y^e$  optica most ingeniously  $\frac{des}{as \cribes}$  $y^{\rm e}$  recovery of  $y^{\rm e}$  pure light, to  $y^{\rm e}$  re= dintegration of y<sup>e</sup> mixture or con= fusion of all  $y^{\rm e}$  colours  $w^{\rm ch}$  turns to  $y^{\text{e}}$  image of common light,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  as he says (cautelously) whitish. At{gt} wch Hy= pothesis I have to say only, that ye strength of white is manifestly greater than tha of  $y^{\rm e}$  colours separated; & all  $y^{\rm e}$ refracted colours collated with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  plain light

 $\{\underline{Ag^t}\}$ 

light compounded of all is a sort of opacity, as in  $y^{\rm e}$  image from  $y^{\rm e}$  diamant cutt of a coach glaSs. The coloured {\_ a}189 part  $\{/shewing\}$  at y<sup>e</sup> edge, to a careleSs eye or at a distance appears like a seam or dark border, & how then shoud  $y^{\rm e}$  mix= ture of those colours; w<sup>ch</sup> they say is resumed in ye next light, & all from y<sup>e</sup> same source, obtein such increase of strength, as  $y^{\rm e}$  comparison of  $y^{\rm e}$ clear light, &  $y^{\rm e}$  coloured part plain= ly shews. And in like manner  $y^{\rm e}$  sun's light into a dark room thro a prism is obscurity compared with  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  same light thro a plain glaSs. And both are derived from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same originall, therefore  $y^e$  difference is made by ob= struction, & not propriety. 151. some in= The very great copia of nice matter in  $y^{\rm e}$  optica wou'd afford endleSs subject stances in y<sup>e</sup> optica of alter considered

Physica

(428)

<sup>189</sup> In the margin a dash, followed by a reversed 's' shape.

altercation touching rays &  $y^{\rm e}$  union & separation of them, & by resolving  $y^{\rm e}$ authors inferences from his experimen/men\ts, weaken his hypothesis; But I shall not undertake so, immense a task, but on= ly touch upon one or two of his instan= ces; as first of prismall colours cast u= pon a paper, If a common horn comb is interposed,  $y^e$  colours will appear cleaving to  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  shades of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  teeth. There is a plain separation & distinction of them. But if  $y^{\rm e}$  comb be paSsed to & fro so as  $y^e$  shaddows of  $y^e$  teeth are not dis= tinctly discerned, then all are in confu= sion. &  $y^{\text{e}}$  image becomes not coloured but white, whence he argues colours mixed make a white or pure light, but non sequitur.<sup>190</sup> For there is no confu= sion in  $y^{\text{e}}$  thing but in our facultys,  $y^{\text{t}}$ have no true Idea of objects passin/Ssing before

IOIIOW .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>190</sup> i.e., 'it does not follow'.

(430) Physica

quick before us, as a coal moving shines an image of a redd ribbon, &  $y^{\rm e}$  like, but  $y^{\text{e}}$  thruth hath no such continua= tion, & y<sup>e</sup> colours in distinct places a<del>re</del>/re\  $y^{\rm e}$  same whither  $y^{\rm e}$  comb paSseth or not, but our sence cannot keep pace with or attend them, whereby they seem to vanish. Another instance is of a barbers bason, w<sup>ch</sup> at a distin= guishing distance shews colours upon all  $y^{\text{e}}$  froth, but at a greater distance (as all froth whatever)  $\{\underline{is}/)$  shews white, that is because  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  colours all intermix in  $y^{\rm e}$  view & so become white. This is answered as  $y^{\rm e}$  former, & it is not fair to argue from our sence to y<sup>e</sup> nature of things, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  colours do not inter= mix but maintain their distinction however our facultys cannot attend them. But here is more, & that is, every bubble

{\_}

Physica (431) 189

bubble of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  froth sends a speck of pure light, & (when  $y^e$  view is neer) those re= flexions are distinct from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  colours, but at distance they run together, & appear as a luminous white. For com= mon daylight is always white, tho reflected from y<sup>e</sup> blackest substances as from pitch; & all powders whatso ever will shew whiteness, tho ye gra= nules are all of one sort coloured: & if y<sup>e</sup> specks of light from each con vex bubble  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  joyn at  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  eye, being stronger & spread into one & /each\ other of= fuscate  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  distinction of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  weaker colorations, & shew perfect white, it is no wonder. To all this it may be an= swered, that whither  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  mixture of co lours be reall or sensible only,  $y^{\rm e}$ consequence is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  same, for 2 colours mixt will produce a 3<sup>d</sup> & yet remain truly

(432) Physica

truly distinct; but no mixture of colours will produce a vivid white. And as to y<sup>e</sup> specks of light, w<sup>ch</sup> makes y<sup>e</sup> coloured froth seem white, they will say that white so reflected contains all colours, w<sup>ch</sup> is petitio ejusdem rei cujus petitur diSsolutio.<sup>191</sup> And this is surely enough upon this subject of light & co= lours.

# Of Sound, y<sup>e</sup> Manner & y<sup>e</sup> Effect

Having produced all my poor stock of thoughts concerning  $y^e$  misterious subject of light,  $w^{ch}$ have been partly collected from  $y^e$  hints of others, & partly added, or ingrafted out of my own nursery; I shall proceed & give a short account of that generall energy  $w^{ch}$  toucheth  $y^e$  sence of all animall, (Es= pecially human) kind, that lives & breaths  $y^e$  common

1532 Of sound & y<sup>e</sup> diffe= rence from light.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>191</sup> A legal term, usually expressed 'exceptio ejus rei cujus petitiur dissolutio nulla est', i.e., 'there can be no plea of that thing of which the dissolution is sought' - i.e., 'you cannot have it both ways'.

## Physica (433) 190

 $y^{\rm e}$  common air of our world; & in gene= rall is understood by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  word sound. This comes aptly after light, being born thro y<sup>e</sup> same mediall conveyance y<sup>e</sup> common fluid; And in one respect both agree,  $w^{\rm ch}$ is that  $y^{\rm e}$  paSsage of either to & from all parts, continually croSsing & recroSsing as (concerning light) hath been demonstr= ted, is also of sound perpetually experi= enced; And both these act in & thro  $y^e$ same fluid without any disorder or im= pediment to each other,  $\{\underline{/and}\}$  if anything can, must excite our admiration, or  $\{/\}$  adora= tion of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  author of nature, that out of such singleneSs of principle, as pure space, connected with human sensation, hath establisht such sublimity of [----?]won= der, as words cannot expreSs; but to for= bear flights & to proceed; in many respects sound & light differ. One is that ye same organ

{\_} {<u>\_rather</u>}

## 4 (434) Physica

organ or part of y<sup>e</sup> body is not affec= ted by both, but each hath its cha= racter apart; for no cause of sound will affect y<sup>e</sup> eye, nor lumen y<sup>e</sup> ear, but what ever impreSseth those organs (& by whatsoever means) produceth  $y^{\rm e}$ proper & respective Ideas of light & sound, & never both. This argues ye dis= tinction of y<sup>e</sup> medium touched before,  $w^{\rm ch}$  is that  $y^{\rm e}$  conveyance of light is by  $y^{\rm e}$  subtile matter to  $w^{\rm ch}~y^{\rm e}$  tunicks & hu= mours of  $y^{\rm e}$  eye are permeable, &  $y^{\rm e}$ GroSser air cannot penetrate; but that (groSs air) impreSseth ye organ of hea= ring,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  ye subtile matter of light paSseth, without any impreSsion at all. Another difference is, that light is rectilinear & doth not lapp round about obstacles, as sound doth. And that argues a fur= ther difference, w<sup>ch</sup> is that light is in instante, but sound is progreSsive, & in time

#### Physica

(<del>(435</del>) 191

time, as when both proceed from y<sup>e</sup> same motive cause, viz<sup>t</sup>: from a gun dis= charged, y<sup>e</sup> light is seen at a distance long before y<sup>e</sup> sound arrives. To conclude, in one thing they agree, w<sup>ch</sup> is reflexion for both do that, & in a like equian= gular manner, so here we dropp y<sup>e</sup> matter of light (sufficiently canvas't already) & fall upon that of sound, considered by it self.

The common image by  $w^{ch} y^e$  generation, & proceSs of sound is represented to our i= maginations, is that of  $y^e$  circling waves upon  $y^e$  surface of calm water, into  $w^{ch}$  a stone is toSsed; those & all other wa= vings of water are analogous to  $y^e$  ac= tions of springs, or pendulums; that is by vibrating equably,  $y^e$  nature of  $w^{ch}$  is not to be entered upon here, being al= ready crittically touched in a small

tract,

153. The affec= tions of watery waves cir= cling (436) Physica

tract, tituled  $y^e$  theory of Sounds, <sup>192</sup> treating of harmony, & discord, without appea= ling to any particula consonant $\{/c\}$ es & diSsonant{(c)}es, or other immechanicall suppositions, so for nicetys we are re= ferred to that. And here we shall pre= sume wthat all waiving of water is quasi pendulous, & as such Isochronous, & therefore y<sup>e</sup> circles open from y<sup>e</sup> center every way equably, that is by equall radius's in equall times, unleSs a par= tiall stiffneSs of  $y^e$  fluid varys  $y^e$  sur= face, & then upon y<sup>e</sup> stiffer part y<sup>e</sup> waves will proceed slower, & if leSs stiff, faster, &  $y^{\rm e}$  figures of  $y^{\rm e}$  circlings will alter accordingly. But ordinarily as ye waves expand & affect larger surfaces, ye force becomes leSs effectuall, & rise leSs but but spread broader,. But if ye course is confined from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  surface of open water to a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>192</sup> The first MS of the 'theory of Sounds' was produced by 1726 (see: Chan, M, Roger North's The musicall grammarian and Theory of sounds : digests of the manuscripts by Mary Chan and Jamie C. Kassler; with an analytical index of 1726 and 1728 Theory of sounds by Janet D. Hine, Kensington, NSW, 1988.) Below, on fol. 195v, MN referrs to the same work as very recent - 'a tract express'. See fol. 7v, above, for other clues to dating this MS.

#### Physica (437) 192

to a channell,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  waves will proceed with much leSs alteration of form, & vigor, & con= tinue apparently longer. And then against obstacles that impede  $y^{\rm e}$  course, it shall con= tinue by reflexion; & also as  $y^{\rm e}$  circlings upon water turn round about all that is in its way, & follow [....?]y<sup>e</sup> surface wherever it leads, Either Laterall or reverst; so shall it appear that no place is sheltered from sounds. And y<sup>e</sup> most remarkable circum= stance of this phaenomenon is that every order of circling, be they never so many shall croSs & recroSs each other, & hold eve= ry one  $y^{\text{e}}$  proper relation to its center without any disturbance, or, as one wou'd expect, utter confusion  $\{ \lfloor \cdot \}^{193}$  I shall further reflect upon this state of watery surfaces, when I come to consider of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  marine tydes.

According to this image we are to respect  $$y^{\rm e}$$  action

154. Of sound & y<sup>e</sup> compreSt wave

 $^{193}$  A curved line, in pencil, has been inserted her. It may be intended to be read as calling for a paragraph break.

Physica

(438)

 $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  action from whence we have  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Ideas of all sounds, for those proceed from ye im= pulses of  $y^{\text{e}}$  groSs air upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  sensitive mem= brane in y<sup>e</sup> ear called y<sup>e</sup> drum. And as all kind of touch  $w^{\rm ch}$  affects  $y^{\rm e}$  optick nerve, ex= cites in us an Idea of lumen, so all tou= ches that affect this membrane (& no= thing else) gives us  $y^{\rm e}$  sence of sound. That  $y^{\rm e}$ immediate instrument of this [....?]perception is ordinarily, y<sup>e</sup> groSs air, is not questioned, so we have only to consider  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  manner how  $y^{\rm e}$  air is put into, & conveys such ac= tion as causeth sound. And that appears to be by some sort of percuSsion of one obdurate body upon another, or violence falling [....?]otherwise upon y<sup>e</sup> air directly, but chiefly by percuSsion. And as to that  $y^{\text{e}}$  nature of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air is to be considered, & chiefly that it is elastick, & if by any trusion it is crowded together, & instantly set free

#### Physica (439)

set free; The compreSsure made by that force as by a spring is disperst every way, & becomes gradient in y<sup>e</sup> air, but continually spreading & y<sup>e</sup> force languefying, in man= ner as y<sup>e</sup> circling waves upon y<sup>e</sup> watery surface proceed. Only instead of acting as y<sup>e</sup> water in plano, it acts spherically in orbe,<sup>194</sup> & carrying that difference, those 2 ac= tions are almost in all respects parallell, of y<sup>e</sup> eye part upon y<sup>e</sup> water plainly, & of y<sup>e</sup> means of hearing intellectually, & that I shall call y<sup>e</sup> compreSt wave.

By what is past it appears that  $y^e$  comprest wave gradient in orbe enters all cavitys & tubes in  $y^e$  way of it, &  $y^e$  hollow duct of every ear receives it, & answers in  $y^e$ sence of sound; How [/] we inquire by what means these waves are  $ex\{/|\langle ci\}\}$ ted, & that de= pends wholly upon celerity, for  $y^e$  air by ceSsion gradually makes way to  $y^e$  transit of slow

155. What force may excite sound

{<u>doe-</u>} {\_}

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 194}$  i.e., 'on a flat surface ... on a round object'.

#### (440) Physica

of slow motions, tho of mighty force, as  $y^e$  falling of a tower, till it meets  $y^e$  ground & a stream of  $y^e$  whole body of  $y^e$  air, as in winds, do not enter  $y^e$  tube of  $y^e$  ear, or (directy) cause sound; but it must be /from\ some action excited in  $y^e$  air, swift be= yond  $y^e$  poSsibillity of means, by ceSsion of  $y^e$  matter to continue, & then follows a compreSsure, of w<sup>ch</sup>  $y^e$  wave disperseth qua= quaversum.

156.
{ 2} Most sounds
are by
percuSsion

There are {2} manners, for this porpose, of forcing y<sup>e</sup> air, one I have called trusi= on, & other percuSsion. Ast to y<sup>e</sup> former y<sup>e</sup> instances are great, but leSs frequent, & will fall under y<sup>e</sup> character of explosions, as thunder, Guns, & aurum fulminans, there are others of leSs account, as y<sup>e</sup> flying of ravens, sound of switches, & y<sup>e</sup> like, but in consequence all will come to y<sup>e</sup> same, as from percuSsion, w<sup>ch</sup> is in continuall obser/vation\ & that {\_}}

Physica (441) 194

& that is by exciting <code>compreSst</code> waves in  $y^{\text{e}}$  air. It is observable of percuSsion, that 2 bodys of common magnitude,  $\{\underline{/moving}\}\$  can scarce ever meet, swift or slow, without a consequence of sound,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  reason of this is, that upon touch  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  separation is instantaneous, & that cannot but excite a wave, but further in y<sup>e</sup> acceSs y<sup>e</sup> air is put into a course conforming with y<sup>e</sup> action, & being stopt in an in= stant, crowds together, & in  $y^{\rm e}$  resilition, Joynes with y<sup>e</sup> impellent, to make a com= preSsure. And if there be no separation by reflection, as when  $y^e$  hatchet sticks in  $y^{\text{e}}$  wood, yet  $y^{\text{e}}$  very crowding of  $y^{\text{e}}$  air at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  stop, will excite a wave, so that from y<sup>e</sup> frequency we may almost af= firm that sound is derived of percuSsion.

There are so many circumstances of va= riety that belong to percuSsion, that we are not to wonder at y<sup>e</sup> vriety of sounds /w<sup>ch</sup>\ from experience

157. How sound continued

#### (442) Physica

experience informes us of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  nature of things distant, No leSs important to our state, than even what comes by vision. If a body im= pelled gives way, as lead, or wool. y<sup>e</sup> per= cuSsion failes of its force, &  $y^{\rm e}$  sound (such as it is) speaks  $y^e$  subject. If it be obdurate & have a spring,  $y^e$  resilition is so strong, that it is distinguished by  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  appellation of ringing, such as from bells, Iron barrs, an= viles, or any thing that results upon a spring,  $w^{ch}$  more or leSs is  $y^e$  property of al= most every thing. But y<sup>e</sup> most remarka= ble phaenomenon of sound is continuance, & that is derived wholly from springs. If y<sup>e</sup> pulses from percuSsion come suc= ceSsively so fast, that we have not ye faculty  $\{\frac{by \ y^e \ action}{}\}$  by  $y^e \ action \ of \ any$ of our members, or (w<sup>ch</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> same) thing) imagination to attend them; then y<sup>e</sup> sound is to us continued; for all such are derived of distinct

{\_}

## Physica (443) 195

of distinct percuSsions, & it is  $y^e$  indisting guishable succeSsion of  $y^e$  pulses that gives them a sensible continuance. Now springy bodys that after one stroke continue  $y^e$ sound, or ring, without more, till by a graduall wasting all sence of it ceaseth, are in themselves  $y^e$  percuSsors; for every return in  $y^e$  vibration is a pulse upon  $y^e$ air, till all is spent, or not perceivable.

It is y<sup>e</sup> nature of springs to vibrate Iso= chronically, & that effect is pleasing to our minds, & by y<sup>e</sup> musitians is called a tone; but if y<sup>e</sup> pulses are irregular or contingent, as scraping of china or cutting  $[-?] / (k) y^e$  like, y<sup>e</sup> sound is offensive to a degree of quarreling with y<sup>e</sup> offenders that make it. And there are also musicall conso nancys, w<sup>ch</sup> are when 2 continuing sounds are carryed on together; if one move quicker than y<sup>e</sup> other they term it sharper

158 Whence mu= sicall sounds (444) Physica

sharper, & y<sup>e</sup> slower more flatt, or base. And by this means y<sup>e</sup> sounds going off from their synchronism, w<sup>ch</sup> is called uni= son, into flatter or sharper are by no means gratefull unleSs y<sup>e</sup> [....?]pulses fall in some proportion; 2/3 3/4 4/5 5/6 &c w<sup>ch</sup> ar termed, fifths, 4<sup>ths</sup> 3<sup>ds</sup>, <sup>6</sup>3<sup>s</sup> &c. w<sup>ch</sup> are y<sup>e</sup> ingredients of harmony in musick, & whereof y<sup>e</sup> conduct, Joyned y<sup>e</sup> skill of knowing opertors of sounds, is y<sup>e</sup> so= lemn undertaking of y<sup>e</sup> profeSsors of that angelicall science, & art of musick w<sup>ch</sup> subject here wou'd admitt a deeper penetration, had it not been exhausted already in a tract express.

But now to conclude with some obser= vations of sounds in generall; y<sup>e</sup> virtu= osi del cimento<sup>195</sup> have made divers expe= riments, as in their beautifull collection may be seen; but one conclusion of theirs I do not

159. Some ob= servations of sounds

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>195</sup> The Saggi di naturali esperienze fatte nell'Academia del Cimento ..., first published in 1666, was a manual for laboratory procedure. The Accademia del Cimento ran in Florence for ten years, from 1657-67. Its members included students of Galileo, with others, under the protection of Prince Leopoldo De Medici and Grand Duke Ferdinando de' Medici. RN's brother Dudley had met the Grand Duke in 1661 (on his journey from London, via Archangel to Turkey). The Accademia was typical of the many scientific academies and societies springing up in the middle of the century for its emphasis on experiment and empirical methodology.

I do not agree to,  $w^{\rm ch}$  is, that sounds paSs  $y^{\rm e}$  same space in  $y^{\rm e}$  same time for, or against  $y^{\rm e}$  wind,  $y^{\rm e}$  cannot be true; for taking y<sup>e</sup> resemblance of water, & in a silent current excite an order of waves, that (center & all) shall paSs along in ye current, so that ye wave cou'd not reach any place up stream, so soon as it wou'd, if  $y^{\rm e}\,$  center, & its circles were not born away, but it is likely  $y^{\text{e}}$  space of  $y^{\text{e}}$  experiment was not enough for proof, upon so swift a transit, & nicety of time. It is to be observed that ye dispersing of sound is not in true cir= cles  $\{\underline{any}/\}$  upward or downward but in y<sup>e</sup> horizontall only, for there y<sup>e</sup> air is equally preSst & of like density; But lower where it is more preSt, & consequent= ly denser,  $y^{\text{e}}$  waves will retard, & not spread so fast. So upward, in greater rarity,  $y^{\rm e}$ sound

{<u>-way</u>}

{<u>-proved</u>}

{\_}}

sound starts quicker, & spreads it self more, & so to  $y^e$  summit if  $y^e$  Amos= phear, where it comes to nothing at all, And y<sup>e</sup> form of y<sup>e</sup> wves, in y<sup>e</sup> groSs is accordingly. this may be in  $pa\{\underline{rt}/\backslash\}$  by  $y^e$ experiment of an high tower, for if persons below speak, those above can scarce be made to hear; but if ye persons above talk but ordinarily loud, those below are amazed. For  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  wave to them is not so dispersed as it is aloft, when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  proceeding is from below. When an ordinance is discharged & heard 3 miles off;  $y^e$  sound is not as when near, a bounce, but a roar. That is because  $y^e$  wave upon/in\ spreading {()as upon water{)} grows broader, & further than that, upon a single discharge 2 sounds shall be heard; &  $y^{\rm e}$  latter loudest; of  $w^{\rm ch}$   $y^{\rm e}$  rea= son is, that y<sup>e</sup> trusion by y<sup>e</sup> fire from y<sup>e</sup> gun is one sound, &  $y^{\rm e}$  return of  $y^{\rm e}$  air into

Physica

(446)
into  $y^{\text{e}}$  gun (w^{\text{ch}} y^{\text{e}} fire had made a Torri= cellian void) with y<sup>e</sup> weight of y<sup>e</sup> atmos phear driving upon it, meets a sudden stop at y<sup>e</sup> bottom, & consequently a strong com preSsure is made there w<sup>ch</sup> starting from  $y^{\text{e}}$  mouth of  $y^{\text{e}}$  gun is  $y^{\text{e}}$  second sound;  $w^{\text{ch}}$ Mr Derham<sup>196</sup> wou'd have to be an eccho, but how shoud that be stronger than ye ori= ginall force? Thus it appears that ye spring of y<sup>e</sup> air bent by its weight is y<sup>e</sup> causa sine qua non<sup>197</sup> of sound. And y<sup>e</sup> pneumatick  $\texttt{engin}^{198}$  shews how it is debillitated by  $y^{\texttt{e}}$ exhaustion of most of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air. Therefore we conclude that beyond  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  atmosphear, or without those sphears of compreSsure that may in like manner belong to ye sun or other planets, but in y<sup>e</sup> Aether at large, there is no such thing as sound, as if it were bestowed wholly upon y<sup>e</sup> planetary inhabitants for y<sup>e</sup> uses of life. Thus sound is propa

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>196</sup> William Derham, 1657-1735, a clergyman, theologian and natural philosopher; among many other things, he was the editor of Robert Hooke's *Posthumous Works*, in 1705, and *Philosphical Experiments*, in 1726. He estimated the speed of sound by observing a gunshot from several distances. He viewed the flash of the shot with a telescope from the tower of his church (St Laurence, Upminster, Essex), while at the same time listening for the sound of the explosion. (*see* Phil. Trans. 1708 26 2-35, online at http://rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/26/313-324.toc; note, when you download the page, that 'Soni Motu' is not a loud and moving author, but part of the title transferred in error ...)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>197</sup> i.e., 'cause without which there would be nothing'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>198</sup> i.e., the 'air pump'.

(448) Physica

propagated by an elasticity, but light by a perpetuall contact of y<sup>e</sup> medium all y<sup>e</sup> world over, so that light flows co= piously from y<sup>e</sup> celestiall luminarys, but they afford us no musick, as hath been childishly pretended. I say'd sound is spent upwards, & descending augmen= ted; this answers y<sup>e</sup> question of travellers, who living above y<sup>e</sup> tempestuous clouds hear no sound of thunder, (w<sup>ch</sup> terrifys y<sup>e</sup> inhabitants below) when they ask y<sup>e</sup> rea= son why it is so.

There are two matters yet concerning y<sup>e</sup> genius of sound y<sup>e</sup> require to be touched {<u>upon</u>}, one is sympathy, & y<sup>e</sup> other augmen tation. The common vibration of one mu sicall string when another sounds in uni= son to it, is called sympathy, & vulgarly esteemed to carry somewhat metphysicall in it, & it serves among y<sup>e</sup> topicks of flou=/rish\ upon

160 The sym= pathy of {\_} sounds

## Physica (449) 198

upon naturall congruitys. But it is pure= ly mechanicall, & tho trans-acted in mi= nuteneSs indistinguishable, yet being well attended to may be understood as well as some things more distinctly perceptible. And all depends upon  $y^{\rm e}$  tone of  $y^{\rm e}$  vibra= ting stprings; w<sup>ch</sup> being so constituted as to vibrate in like time, if one sounds, y<sup>e</sup> other must move, & sound in company; for y<sup>e</sup> compreSst waves; w<sup>ch</sup> more or leSs move every thing in their way, move this quiet string into action equall timed, &then are no stop /to\ but continually favour  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  vibrations of each other whereby they continue & become apparent, whereas other springs not so quallifyed however moved, are by  $y^{\rm e}$  succeSsive pulses stopt from continuing to vibrate; & if it happens that at first between two sounds there is not this exact conformity of pulses,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  action instantly 16<del>2</del>i, <del>y</del>eThe aug= mentation tation of

sounds

# (450)

instantly brings them together, not by any operations of y<sup>e</sup> compreSt waves re= ciprocally upon each other in y<sup>e</sup> air, but by working upon each others spring to accellerate or retard till they agree. And for this reason strings or pipes will in some measure tune one another; but bells will not, for y<sup>e</sup> rigiddity of y<sup>e</sup> mettall will not permitt any alte= ration of y<sup>e</sup> proper vibrations, & for that reason in consort, bells hardly ever sound in tune.

Then next y<sup>e</sup> augmentation of sounds affords matter of considerable specula= tion, for what is y<sup>e</sup> reason that in most flatile instruments there seems to be no warrantable proportion between y<sup>e</sup> in= spiring force & y<sup>e</sup> magnitude of y<sup>e</sup> sound; as in a common organ pipe, y<sup>e</sup> air at y<sup>e</sup> mouth, if y<sup>e</sup> pipe happens not to speak, is a trifle but upon speaking y<sup>t</sup> trifle

## Physica (451) 199

trifle roars out so that one may wonder whence that force of sound comes:, so in a Trumpet  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  eruptions at  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  lipps without y<sup>e</sup> instrument, are scare heard, but with ye tube are heard at a wonderfull dis= tance, & in  $y^{\rm e}$  open air. The reason at this (, Joyning y<sup>e</sup> proper formation of y<sup>e</sup> tubes, accounted for elsewehere) is y<sup>e</sup> ur= ging, of y<sup>e</sup> uniform pulses in y<sup>e</sup> paSsing one upon another with a vis impreSsa of all, whereby they spread into each other, & so conglomerate into one uni= ted force; And so  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ingredients, small of themselves, combining in this manner prove great; & nothing is more common, than that small forces by iterations shall produce much superior effects;  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  will best be explained by instances, as in com= mon clocks what keeps in motion  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  weigh= ty pendulum, but  $y^{\rm e}$  aiding its vis impreSsa by a slight

(452)

Physica

by a slight touch /at every\ return? And how comes a weak mortall to mount a bell of am immense weight till it is sett with y<sup>e</sup> mouth upwards, but a small addition (comparatively) being properly applyed to  $y^{\rm e}$  vis impreSsa of  $y^{\rm e}$  swing? & if such an ascititious force cou'd be had gratis, y<sup>e</sup> perpetuall motion woud be sound/on\ found out. And so it is in all cases of continuing or vibratory sounds, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  compreSst waves accumulate & enforce each other. I shewed  $y^{\rm e}$  like consequences in  $y^{\rm e}$  cases of light & flame. For light is composed of single pulses, of themselves next to nothing, but innumerables acting together in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ same direction [.....?]combine [....?]& become [....?]thereby [....?]great, & what is  $y^e \mbox{ flame of a single}$ straw, yet when many burn together, those little uniting in one direction  $\operatorname{can}$ pose a pyramid of flame. So  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  minute pulses

pulses of a continuing sound by a sort of co= alescence make such surprizing vocifera= tions, as must every day be observed.

# Of y<sup>e</sup> Marine tydes

Nothing that belongs to ye terraqueous Globe is more exposed to common obser= vation than y<sup>e</sup> ordinary flux & reflux of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sea. It is no wonder that we can= not trace  $y^e$  powers that cause such al= ternations of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  waters up to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  originall source of them, considering that  $y^{\rm e}$  im= mensity of y<sup>e</sup> terraqueous globe, colla= ted with our  $\texttt{pus}_{\textstyle il}/\texttt{il}\texttt{lity},$  interdicts our having a tollerable naturall history of them. And altho we navigate almost all y<sup>e</sup> world over yet we know little how  $y^{\text{e}}$  tydes are in  $y^{\text{e}}$  main ocean. It is certain they are not they re as in our ri= vers current to & fro, nor so as to continue a perpe

In y<sup>e</sup> main seas tydes not current but lifting

#### (454) Physica

a perpetuall stream of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole main sea round y<sup>e</sup> globe in one grand wave, because  $y^e$  saylors fancy  $y^e$  navigation ea= syer one way than y<sup>e</sup> other, for if y<sup>e</sup> tydes were current, they might as other currents prove them. But by all symptomes of y<sup>e</sup> action, it appears that y<sup>e</sup> motion is like that of common waves heaving & subsi= ding alternatim, 199 & when pinched at shoars & strait channells take a course of ebbing & flowing,  $y^{\rm e}$  like of  $w^{\rm ch}$  any one that stands by  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  sea side may ob serve even of  $y^e$  common waves,  $w^{ch}$  are lifting but not gradient till ye shoals & narrowneSses constrain them; & so they come & retire in near equall times but not exactly, w<sup>ch</sup> hath made some fancy  $y^e$  tenth wave most remarkable.

As to y<sup>e</sup> tydes in generall, y<sup>e</sup> great & al= most insolvable mistery is, that in all y<sup>e</sup> alternations of them, respect is had to y<sup>e</sup> moons

Tydes reflect y<sup>e</sup> moons course but not ex= actly

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>199</sup> i.e., 'in alternation'.

## Physica (455) 201

 $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  moons course so that folks may thereby prognosticate ye high & low waters, toge= ther with  $y^{\rm e}$  springs & neaps that almost of course happen; But we must take along that however there is symptome e= nough in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  phaenomena to demonstrate some correlation of cause between y<sup>e</sup> moons course, & y<sup>e</sup> tydes, yet it is not so ma= thematicall as to point out an imme= diate influence of one upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  other, like that of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  magnet upon iron, but there appears much incerteinty & notable vari= ations in  $y^{\rm e}$  times; for sometimes  $y^{\rm e}$  tydes shall fall very wide of  $y^e$  lunar times, & not only hours, but days, 3, or 4, one way or [ye?] other, & seldome or never exact= ly consonant with  $y^{\text{e}}$  moons transits;  $w^{\text{ch}}$ seems to shew that  $y^e$  tydes are not im= mediately, but consequentially confor= mable thereto. As when fire is applyed to fewell,  $y^e$  conflagration follows, or a mi/nute  $\$ touch

(456) Physica

touch continues y<sup>e</sup> motion of a large swing pendulum; That is, somewhat else effective conspires with y<sup>e</sup> moons in= fluence to continue y<sup>e</sup> action of y<sup>e</sup> waters, & that they are not agitated to flow & reflow by that alone, y<sup>e</sup> matter I shall endeavour to clear afterwards.

The ancients scarce ever dreamt of fin= ding out a resolution of tydes, but when y<sup>e</sup> earths motion was agreed, some fancyed an inequallity in that to be y<sup>e</sup> cause, but this cou'd not be without a discovery in our account of time. Carte= sius was y<sup>e</sup> first who hit upon a tolle= rable resolution, w<sup>ch</sup> was that y<sup>e</sup> strait between y<sup>e</sup> moon (En paSsant) & y<sup>e</sup> earth made a compreSsure that affected y<sup>e</sup> wa= ters, & considered y<sup>e</sup> globe as being all sea, & that y<sup>e</sup> compreSsure had like effect on y<sup>e</sup> opposite, w<sup>ch</sup> caused y<sup>e</sup> air & waters to turn ovall, with y<sup>e</sup> shortest diameter always attendant

The Car= tesian solu= tion incom= petent.

#### Physica (457) 202

attendant upon y  $^{\rm e}$  moon, & y  $^{\rm e}$  springs & neaps were changed upon proximity or distance of that planet. This tho' seeming plausi= ble, doth not come up to a solution, for besides it doth not answer all  $y^{\rm e}$  circum= stances, as latter authors have shewed,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$ preSsure under y<sup>e</sup> moon, tho it is somewhat, yet may not be allowed sufficient to move their waters from y<sup>e</sup> rotundity of their surface, by an immediate force, &much leSs on  $y^{\rm e}$  opposite hemisphear; & such a compreSsure must remove  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole globe, as well as  $y^e~\{\underline{wa}\}\text{ters},$  unless somewhat on  $y^{\rm e}$  other side stood  $y^{\rm e}$  thrust; & such dislocation of  $y^{\rm e}$  center wou'd be discove= red in other phaenomena.

The last solution is that of S<sup>r</sup> Is: Newton w<sup>ch</sup> carrys it full cry omniomodo<sup>200</sup> per= fect. He alters y<sup>e</sup> state of y<sup>e</sup> fact, & suppo= seth y<sup>e</sup> waters lifted & not compreSsed under y<sup>e</sup> moon; this may be affirmed, but hardly proved

{<u>waters</u>}

The Newto= nian solu= tion by at= traction not suffi= cient

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>200</sup> i.e, 'in every way, completely'.

(458) Physica

proved, for at rivers & creeks no account is to be taken, & what shou'd plumb ye main sea; Either may produce  $y^{\rm e}$  effect, w<sup>ch</sup> makes me fancy it is neither constant= ly but as shall happen, of  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  more after= wards. Now supposing  $y^{\rm e}$  rising, it is ascri= bed to y<sup>e</sup> power of universall attraction, whereby all bodys co=attract according to ye substance & distance. And according= ly when y<sup>e</sup> moon is verticall, y<sup>e</sup> waters of  $y^{\rm e}$  sea are by attraction lifted, & as  $y^{\rm e}$  moon paSseth, demitted,  $w^{\rm ch}$  makes  $y^{\rm e}$ 12, hours tyde, six flowing & as much ebbing. And to solve  $y^{\rm e}$  neaps & springs,  $y^{\rm e}$ sun is introduced, but with a minor attrac= tion, & barring some anomala caused by  $y^e$  winds &ca, all  $y^e$  dubia<sup>201</sup> about  $y^e$  ma= rine tydes, by these two attractive powers are resolved. There may be divers objec= tions to this common with ye former, as that an opperation on  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  one side of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ globe

## Physica (459) 203

globe cannot affect y<sup>e</sup> other, & that y<sup>e</sup> great variations of y<sup>e</sup> tydes in severall parts of y<sup>e</sup> world cannot fall under this, or any [rulle?] yet known, But ats to y<sup>e</sup> principle, (Attraction,) ever alledged but never proved, I shall take a rounder course, & (for argument sake admitting y<sup>e</sup> hypothesis) endeavour to shew that it is utterly incompetent for y<sup>e</sup> present porpose wherein it is used.

Here for singleneSs of argument, I shall referr wholly to y<sup>e</sup> moon, whereof y<sup>e</sup> attrac= tion is allowed to be more considerable, & by that; frame an answer to y<sup>e</sup> whole, So taking y<sup>e</sup> attraction as it is delivered to us, it works not supeficially as elec= tricks, tat lift what is next, but upon y<sup>e</sup> whole solid substance of y<sup>e</sup> body ex= posed to it, for its force, as they say, is ac= cording to density; therefore y<sup>e</sup> moons at= traction affects y<sup>e</sup> whole terrestriall globe, & not

Fatall objection to y<sup>e</sup> attrac= tive scheme

(460) Physica

& not any one part more than another, that is to say, not  $y^{\text{e}}$  waters of  $y^{\text{e}}$  sea more more than  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  solid earth & stone. And this being so, y<sup>e</sup> attraction shall not only work upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  waters tending to lift them, but draw  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole globe along, whereby there succeeds no partiall lifting at all. If to this it be said that y<sup>e</sup> waters are a yielding body, & will {yield to} ye force readyer, or more than  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  solid, I answer that such wou'd be  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  consequence, if any means held back  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth, as by some chain from a stated part of  $y^{\rm e}$  skys & affixt to the earths center, but  $y^e$  whole is e=qually free to comply with  $y^{\rm e}$  attrac= tion that seiseth all alike; & no rea= son can be given why any part (as  $y^{\rm e}$ waters) shou'd out run  $y^{\text{e}}$  rest as  $y^{\text{e}}$  lifting by attraction supposeth.

It is hard to answer why  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  power that lifts y<sup>e</sup> waters shou'd not separate & carry them clean

Confirmed by instances parallell

{comply w<sup>th</sup>}

clean away, for by that action  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  gravity is weaker to hold back, &  $y^{\rm e}$  attraction sytron= ger to lift up, such is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  consequence of distance. But, say they, y<sup>e</sup> waters are a te= nacious body & will not readily separate,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is true, but then what parts happen to devide, must go for it, as also  $y^e$  sands of Arabia when under y<sup>e</sup> moon raised by y<sup>e</sup> winds & follow y<sup>e</sup> moon. I know a ballance is assigned between  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of sinking by means of gravity, &  $y^{\rm e}$  rising by means of attraction, & such equi= librity determines ye height of ye tides. But here we forget that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  very center is drawn as well as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  waters, & there is nothing to hold that back, to raise such a [conterntion?], but all go pari  $paSsu^{202}$ together. Let me give a familiar & in= telligible example; conceive a ligno aque=/ous\ ball<sup>203</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>202</sup> i.e., 'in step'.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 203}$  i.e., 'a ball of wood and water' - MN is suggesting an experimental apparatus.

(462) Physica

ball, resembling  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  terraqueous globe, affixt in y<sup>e</sup> air. The force of gravity ( $\mathtt{w}^{\mathtt{ch}}$  is esteemed a proper attraction) shall draw away  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water, either to swell downward, or to dropp away leaving  $y^{\text{e}}$  woody part behind; but if at  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  first instance,  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  whole together is freed in y<sup>e</sup> air, y<sup>e</sup> water shall not out= run y<sup>e</sup> wood (supposing that y<sup>e</sup> heavyest) nor swell at all upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  surface of it, but both alike obey  $y^{\rm e}$  force of at= traction, by falling in statu quo<sup>204</sup> toge= ther. but if that force were in any de= gree sudden, so as to give  $y^{\rm e}$  substance a greater celerity or jogg,  $y^{\rm e}$  watry or looser part, woud rather hang back than advance; & (supposing, (as  $y^{\rm e}$  truth is) that y<sup>e</sup> solids of y<sup>e</sup> globe, are more weighty, that is more exposed to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of attraction, than y<sup>e</sup>

than  $y^{\rm e}$  waters,  $w^{\rm ch}$  are lighter, there is rea= son to argue that attraction shou'd ra= ther depreSs than raise  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  waters; as if y<sup>e</sup> ball afore-mentioned were auria= queous,<sup>205</sup> & let fall, y<sup>e</sup> waters wou'd reluct & not outrun y<sup>e</sup> gold. In short, untill some principle in nature is found out that shall attack ye earths center, qua center, & hold it back from complying with  $y^{\rm e}$  lunar attraction, leaving  $y^{\rm e}$  cir= cumambient matter free to contend, & come to one equilibrium between  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  two powers; it will become impoSsible to re= solve  $y^{\text{e}}$  flux & reflux of  $y^{\text{e}}$  sea, by  $y^{\text{e}}$ Hypothesis of attraction. It will be in vain to appeal unto centripetation, mo= tus in directum, or any imaginary pow= er whatever, to cast any influence upon our globe, favouring  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  notion of tydes by attraction for they must affect  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth as a

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 205}$  i.e., 'a ball of gold and water'

Use to be made of y<sup>e</sup> lunar com= preSsion, <del>bu</del> but in part only

## (464) Physica

as a totum, & not by parts, since all parts are equally subject. I must con= feSs I am here an adventurer, &, I may say, against wind & tyde, attaquing y<sup>e</sup> Palladium of y<sup>e</sup> modern philosophy, of w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> author Idolized, as having by his attractive scheme, untyed y<sup>e</sup> Gordian knot of nature, a work (as some pro= fanely say) plusquam humane.<sup>206</sup> But as a [sectator?] of truth, I deferr only to y<sup>e</sup> evidences of it as they appear to me, abstracting all personall considerations or prejudices whatsoever.

Objections raised against any received opinion are seldom fairly enterteined without a retribution of somewhat better in y<sup>e</sup> room, Els there remains a suspicion of ill nature, or malevo= lence; w<sup>ch</sup> is not purged without a com= petent rectification. For what profit is there

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>206</sup> The Palladium was a small ancient wooden figure of Pallas maintained as a sacred relic in Troy and later carried to Rome by Aeneas. The Gordian Knot was a knot (or riddle) that none could undo (or solve) until Alexander simply cut through it with a sweep of his sword. '*Plusquam humane*' means 'super human'.

## Physica (465) 206

there in overturning a scientifick struc= ture, without erecting a better. Therefore it concerns me that have oppugned  $y^{\rm e}\ 2$ grand Analyses of y<sup>e</sup> marine tydes, es= pecially  $y^e$  latter, of  $w^{ch} y^e$  Eureka is al= most universally ecchoed, to start another,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  if not competent to stop all further inquiry, may yet afford some matter of fresh consideration, & thereby perhaps obtain a clearer resolution of y<sup>e</sup> sub= ject than hath yet appeared. And in order to that I observe that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  supposed power of attraction, not only for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  in competency already declared, but for non= entity also (since{,  $/y^e \setminus$ ] whole scheme of that Energy is utterly denyed) ceaseth; there remains no conceivable possibillity of any influence of  $y^{\text{e}}$  moon upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  earths surface, but by means of  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm compreSsion}$ before

{\_}

## (466) Physica

before touched upon, & however as to y<sup>e</sup> groSs effects, that must be laid aside also, & we must find some other mo= tive principle to sustein such violent agitations as appear i y<sup>e</sup> flux & re= flux of y<sup>e</sup> seas, for w<sup>ch</sup> in toto y<sup>e</sup> com= preSsure cannot but be insufficient, yet we must make some use of it, as effectuall, not of direct force, but for regulation only in y<sup>e</sup> manner I am <del>a</del> about to shew.

My scheme is founded upon y<sup>e</sup> constant & known propertys of all watery sur= faces small & great universally observa= ble; & that is after y<sup>e</sup> powers that disturbed them ceased to undulate from leSser to more spread{<u>ings</u>}, Isochronically & very rarely, {<u>/And</u>} that in small waters on= ly appear wholly to cease, & if fresh disturbances happen, y<sup>e</sup> effect will

be seen

A new scheme of y<sup>e</sup> tydes by proper un= dulations

{<u>heavings</u>}

{\_\_\_}} {\_\_\_} Physica (467) 207

be seen upon, & conssistent with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  former, in small upon greater, & all in course tending to a coalescence, & at last cea= sing (If they ever cease) in a true level; But this happens only to small waters, for y<sup>e</sup> greater are subject to such per= petuall disturbances, that they never stand in a true level, but however seeming flatt, there will be heavings, of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  boats & shipps are for  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  most part sensible. And for beteter clearing  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  condition of immense actions, it is usefull to assume ye ordinary images of leSser matters more comprehensible; As here, a large pool of water;  $w^{\rm ch}$  ei= ther rippled with minor waves, or not, is scarce ever without groSs heavings of y<sup>e</sup> water in equable times as may be per= ceived at  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  shores, or straits, where  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ liftings by coarctation byecome currents for  $w^{ch}$ 

## (468) Physica

for y<sup>e</sup> take this experiment, draw a s small trench from y<sup>e</sup> water upon y<sup>e</sup> shoar a little rising, & (even) in a calm one may observe y<sup>e</sup> water run up that trench & so back again Equably at certain times, but much more sensibly when y<sup>e</sup> water is under a disturbance of wavs, & these itions & reditions shall be by larger intervalls at y<sup>e</sup> brink of lar= ger than of smaller waters because y<sup>e</sup> expanse of y<sup>e</sup> heave is greater.

It is obvious to transferr this Image of a minor water to  $y^e$  great sea of  $w^{ch}$  no part is long without disturbance of waves,  $w^{ch}$  coalescent one under another produce vast heavings in  $y^e$  main,  $w^{ch}$  at shoars & creaks shew themselves in currents,  $y^e$ certain consequences of rising waters contracted. And this consequence of  $y^e$ marine swellings, I must presume to

call

The sea heaves in great waves & tydes wou'd be if no moon, but irregular.

## Physica (469) 208

call  $y^{\text{e}}$  tydes,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  work equably up & down mechanically, according to common hydrolo= gy, without any need of conjuring up any spirits of attraction or compreSsion to excite  $y^{\rm e}$  common flux & reflux of  $y^{\rm e}$  sea waters; so that I must conclude that if there were no moon, nor ever had been any, yet there wou'd be marine tydes, & nearly at equall intervalls, but whither 12, 13, 14, {/hours\} or any other periods of time may not in such case be determined; because  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  magnitude or expanse of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  heaves must in those measures by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  regulator. Nor can it be declared what, or how many heavs may fall out in any part of ye sea, as be= tween  $y^{\rm e}$  lands end &  $y^{\rm e}$  cours of America w<sup>ch</sup> cannot be surveyed by us, but one may safely opine that it is not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole body of ye sea that riseth & subsides at every high & low tydes (as all  $y^e$  modern schemes suppose) Such a

{\_}}

The moon re gulates y<sup>e</sup> tydes to 12 hour heaves

## (470) Physica

such a body of water being to great (com= paratively) to dance up & down so fast, but y<sup>e</sup> action is restrained to competently expan= ded waves, or heavings so as y<sup>e</sup> measures may be conform to  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  times. And it is to be observed of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  common wves of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sea, that they spread according to circumstances of breadth & depth of y<sup>e</sup> waters, as in y<sup>e</sup> bay of Biscay more than in st Georges channell, & in minor waters, ye largest break into many waves or heaves, but ever those of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  leSser work faster than  $y^{\text{e}}$  othere. But now  $y^{\text{e}}$  labor & opus is to shew  $y^{\text{e}}$  moons influence upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  working of  $y^{\text{e}}$ waters, & by what means they are reduced & confined to 12 hour heaves, not without some inequallitys at certein times, I shall not concern my self to know whither  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ moon is, or is not always verticall to either  $y^{\rm e}$  liftings or depreSsions of  $y^{\rm e}$  surface, but con= ceive that it is indifferent & contingent, & that either

#### Physica (471) 209

either way  $y^{\rm e}$  consequences as to  $y^{\rm e}$  heaves will be  $y^e$  same, that is, in about 12 hour periods,  $w^{ch}$ will answer  $y^{\rm e}$  relation to  $y^{\rm e}$  moon; And I do not find y<sup>e</sup> contrary of this made out, altho y<sup>e</sup> authors are pleased to suppose it in their own way, nor doth  $y^{\text{e}}$  rule of  $y^{\text{e}}$  tydes hold so certainly to hours, to justify them in either. But I conceive that whither by originall appointment, or y<sup>e</sup> result of continuall agitation, ye heaves of ye sea, whither many or few, are reduced to such expanse as by water-law shall keep time near ly with  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  moons course. That it is not  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$ moon it self paSsing by or any virtue from it, that directly raiseth or depreSseth  $y^{\rm e}$  ma= rine surface; but  $y^{\text{e}}$  proper undulations of  $y^{\text{e}}$ moving waters, to  $w^{\rm ch}$  all  $y^{\rm e}$  waters in  $y^{\rm e}$  world are alike subject; & if ye moon were anni= hilated ye tydes wou'd continue nearly ye same for many years if not ages to come, & ask as many to be restored again.

But we must attribute somewhat influentiall upon  $y^e$  surface of  $y^e$  sea, by reason of  $y^e$  coarcta/tion/ of  $y^e$ 

The sweep at y<sup>e</sup> moons paSsing regu= lates y<sup>e</sup> tyde hours {\_}}

(472) Physica

of  $y^{\text{e}}$  medium between  $y^{\text{e}}$  planet &  $y^{\text{e}}$  earth;  $w^{\rm ch}$  hath been called compreSsure, but wou'd be more properly termed pulsion, operating by dri= ving, in manner as a sweep or as y<sup>e</sup> winds lift & lett fall  $y^{\rm e}$  waves, rather than by crowding from above  $w^{ch}$  I have argued aready to be in= sufficient. But this influence hath no force, either by pulsion as a wind or otherwise to make any impreSsion or raise y<sup>e</sup> least wave upon y<sup>e</sup> surface, such is y<sup>e</sup> exillity of it; but it may be allowed ye effect of a slight spring, near  $y^{\text{e}}$  center or fulchrum of a weighty & long pendulum, w<sup>ch</sup> in a state of rest {<u>so</u>?} is not put in action by such a force in that manner applyed altho multiplyed 100 times over, but yet small as it is it shall suffice to continue y<sup>e</sup> pendulous movement indefinitely. And  $y^{\text{e}}$  force of  $y^{\text{e}}$  swing is not derived of  $y^{\text{e}}$  small spring, but from  $y^e \ w{\mbox{at}}/{\mbox{eight}} \ \mbox{of} \ y^e \ \mbox{pendulum it}$ self; but yet much adminiculum<sup>207</sup> serves to keep  $y^e$  action going,  $w^{ch}$  of it self woud not ex= cite a scruple of it. Do if we conceive y<sup>e</sup> surface of y<sup>e</sup>

Pysica

(473) 210

of y<sup>e</sup> sea to be a perfect flatt without any heavings at all, it is not 20 moons paSsing by, either by traction or pulsion wou'd raise any, or be y<sup>e</sup> cause of y<sup>e</sup> least tyde. But y<sup>e</sup> waters always acting by pendulum law, be= ing once excited to wave in a certein proporti= on, that pusill difference of y<sup>e</sup> medium about y<sup>e</sup> moon paSsing, may serve to con= tinue y<sup>e</sup> wavings in y<sup>e</sup> same manner, as well when y<sup>e</sup> moon is absent as when pre= sent.

But there is a slighter imployment for y<sup>e</sup> moon than to contribute much, if any thing, towards y<sup>e</sup> exciting or continuing y<sup>e</sup> tyde waves upon y<sup>e</sup> surface, w<sup>ch</sup> hath al= ready been consigned upon y<sup>e</sup> ordinary dis= turbances by y<sup>e</sup> winds, & that is only y<sup>e</sup> com= partition of y<sup>e</sup> waves that they might fall in such magnitudes ballancing each other, as might correspond y<sup>e</sup> going & returning of y<sup>e</sup> moon, that is by near 12 hour heaves, w<sup>ch</sup> by partly resisting, & partly promoting, will after many turns bring each other to a con/formity\; there

The man= ner by brea= king y<sup>e</sup> heaves so as to con= form

(4<del>9</del>74) Physica

there are diverse operations that may serve to explicate this effect, as musicall vibra= tions that yielding unison sounds, when set= ting out at different & contingent times,  $w^{\rm ch}$ [continuing?] wou'd prove discord, yet acting against each other soon fall into harmo= ny of motion & sound. So funipendulums with weights at different lengths set ago= ing after a few croSs tuggs shall fall in= to accord in  $y^e$  easyest & best manner that may be. Why then shoud it seem strange that  $y^{\text{e}}$  moon by 12 hour returns, shou'd after many ages bring  $y^{\rm e}$  great ocean's un= dulating surface, to such a conformity of motion, as may answer  $y^{\rm e}$  flux & reflux of our tyde shoars & rivers? I seek not here to resolve particularly ye various phaeno= mena & anomala observed of y<sup>e</sup> tydes, I shoud indeed wonder if they shou'd be exact= ly regular, seeing no Energys in  $y^{\rm e}$  world are so. But conidering ye moon's proximi= ty & distance, Islands, promontorys, tempes= tuous times & ye like, we need not be amaz=/zed\ to hear

2	1	1	r
2	т	т	т

	Physica ( <del>475</del> ) 211
{ <u>litle or</u> }	to hear of half tydes, 3 quarter tydes, & sometimes (as at St Helena) {//} no tydes at all, & y <sup>e</sup> meer view of a fictitious globe will plainly shew reason enough for greater irregularitys of tydes than we are yet acquainted with.
171.	Of Meteors.
Difficulty	
about me=	I have had thoughts of entering into y <sup>e</sup> a=
teors	bySs of natural philosophy so deep as to offer
	at some account of meteors, w <sup>ch</sup> are y <sup>e</sup> appea=
	rances in y <sup>e</sup> air. Against w <sup>ch</sup> design it occurrs,
	that not a little of those matters have been
	touched already, that is y $^{ m e}$ genesis & state of y $^{ m e}$
	air, y $^{ m e}$ atmosphear with its propertys, & y $^{ m e}$
	vain science of vapours. And what remains
	may be seen', tis true, but not, as they say
	felt, being [inconsct?] in mimmensity or mi=
	nuteneSs where our facultys will not reach,
{ <u>clear</u> }	& { <u>cle</u> }ar solutions, such are desired, will
	not be given, & $y^e$ most that can be said
	will amount but to naturll history. Of
	this sort

	(476)	Physica
{ <u>-Ja-</u> ?}	this sort are parselenes, Ha tes, <sup>208</sup> lumens, snow, storm, t cane, whirlwin of audacity to & if I do touc with a pair of to what relate propertys, w <sup>ch</sup> meter, serve t shall ,respect diffused.	<pre>y<sup>e</sup> rainbow, y<sup>e</sup> parhelia, los, Auroras, Ignis {jocu}lan= or coruscations, winds, clouds, hunder, lightning, Hurri= ds, mists &amp; rain. It is a sort meddle too much with these, h it must be, as they say, tongs, timorously; But as s to y<sup>e</sup> air, its spring, &amp; known of late by means of y<sup>e</sup> Baero= o prognosticate weather I ing y<sup>e</sup> usefull part, be more</pre>
172 The rain= bow & par= helia.	The chief mist to y <sup>e</sup> optick so colours, in th else, is eluci same as appear traveller when a due position lings whatever	ery of y <sup>e</sup> rain-bow belongs ciences, where y <sup>e</sup> subject of at as clearly, as in any thing datd. The colours are y <sup>e</sup> very in y <sup>e</sup> dropps of dew to a y <sup>e</sup> sun shines, & y <sup>e</sup> like in from any w[-?]atery sprink= . And such is y <sup>e</sup> rain, when

 $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  sun shines upon it. But  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  exterior re= flexions from  $y^e$  dropps, cast only a faint lumen, opposite to  $y^e$  sun; as for  $y^e$  arcuate colourations  $y^e$  regularity of  $y^e$  phaenome= non, permitts a scrutiny of all that's Ge= metricall belonging to it. For when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$ paSsage of y<sup>e</sup> y<sup>e</sup> light from y<sup>e</sup> sun thro a sin= gle drop t comes to y<sup>e</sup> eye, it hath past thro' 2 refractions & one interior reflexion, & by y<sup>e</sup> rules of refraction must shew colours. And supposing a line from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun thro your eye extended, an angle of ..... degrees by a line from your eye, & so turned round  $y^{\text{e}}$  former, making a sort of cone,  $y^{\text{e}}$  coloured light will come according to that angle, &shew a perfect  $\{/\cir\}$  cle. The colours are equally dispersed every way, & every spectator hath only those that come in such an angle, & as he moves  $y^{\rm e}$  colours are different, & this is all that is known of  $y^e$  rainbow, & is lucu/lently  $\$ described

{arch of a}

#### (478) Physica

described by Cartesius & others since him. The parhelian circles are of like nature, but  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rule, as of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rainbow, is not known, it is enough that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  colours come regular= ly by some kinds of refractions in humid dropps, & when  $y^{\rm e}$  circles croSs each other,  $y^e$  light & colours &  $y^e$  intersections are much more vivid, & strong, & those are  $y^{\rm e}$  parhe= lia, or as they call them mock suns. And these appear sometimes intire & sometimes by pieces, & so more or leSs vivid accor= ding to circumstances. I know that in all these cases, vapours are lett in to ye pre= rogative of ruling, w<sup>ch</sup>  $\{\underline{is}/\}$  by humid dropps & nothing else; for where there is not somewhat of cloud or mystineSs in y<sup>e</sup> air, no parhelia or other such meteors appear.

In y<sup>e</sup> late totall eclipse of y<sup>e</sup> sun,<sup>209</sup> at y<sup>e</sup> moons edge upon y<sup>e</sup> emersion appeared y<sup>e</sup> most vivid colours that ever were seen. From

{<u>are -</u>}

173. Coloured Eclipse & Halos

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>209</sup> This could refer to the eclipses of either May 3, 1715 or May 22, 1724, most likely the 1724 event; both were more or less complete, and both were visible all across England, both were also very well observed and recorded. There were no further significant (let alone total) eclipses in England until the twentieth century.

From whence an atmosphear about  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$ moon is gueSsed at; & must be judged from analogy with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  production of colours here below, altho  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  specifick ingredi= ents are not known. As for  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm Halos}$  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  are most common, they are always in a misty air uniform & not broken by clouds; thay shew little colour, & that very dusky, but obscurity in a cir= cle makes y<sup>e</sup> figure, having y<sup>e</sup> lumina= ry in its center. It is observed that when light is collected into one place, other pla= ces, deprived of their light, shew dark, as we see by burning glaSses, &  $y^{\rm e}$  lights of that genus, sometimes used in London streets. This occasions me to think, that in Halos y<sup>e</sup> light by reflection from y<sup>e</sup> humid dropps being at a certain angle toSs't inwards, a darkeneSs takes place, & makes an intire circle; w<sup>ch</sup> is but a slight acct

(480) Physica

account, tho all that I know can be said of  $y^e$  matter.

The Aurora Borealis commonly appears when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  year is declining towards win= ter when  $y^{\text{e}}$  coolneSs increasing  $y^{\text{e}}$  air is full of frequent humiditys, & probably very high in y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear;<sup>210</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> may be argued from y<sup>e</sup> very rarity or thinneSs of y<sup>e</sup> clouds at such times. And y<sup>e</sup> great luminary lying on  $y^{\rm e}$  north side, projects light upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  humid air, as when it is lofty may be imagined, & then y<sup>e</sup> wind gently fanning  $y^{\rm e}$  humidity to & fro sometimes opening & sometimes closing, y<sup>e</sup> light after many reflections gives very odd appearances, but never in any regular or steddy form. As for ye coru= cations, as falling starrs &c that seem to shoot various ways, they are a train of an ignis-lambent ^211 matter, w<sup>ch</sup> being ac-/cended  $\$ follows

174. Aurora Borealis & coruscations

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>210</sup> RN developed a very complete account of the nature and causes of the Aurora following the great display of March 1716, *see* BL Add MS 32546, fol. 124r ff.

## Physica (451) 214

follows as if somewhat moved, like a train of gunpowder fired, w<sup>ch</sup> seems to run along as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  matter leads it. And of this sort may be y<sup>e</sup> evening coruscations, for what in one place may be a falling starr, at a distance, will appear a co= ruscation, for they are always seen near ye Horizon, & very often between layers of clouds w<sup>ch</sup> by reflexion increase y<sup>e</sup> coruscation, but cannot be seen by those underneath; very often Thunder storms,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{ch}$  have caused great disorders in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air, & left spirituous matter not apt for fire, (but to shine only) & deter= mine, leaving  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  succeeding night subject to coruscations. And we are not to pre= sume these appearances to be pure night work, but rather more spread by day, as I have seen some egregious lumens of incomparabl beauty so long as they lasted. As to

175 Couds & rain

## (482) Physica

As to clouds there is no distinction be= tween them, & common mists, only  $y^{\rm e}$  for= mer are either bredd in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air high, or when generated, taken up by winds, & consisting of dropps of water or Ice, interceps  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ sun's light, as dust, smoak, or any such solids concumulated in y<sup>e</sup> air below, will do. These dropps, as hath been tou= ched, are bredd by a very familliar a= gency called distillation; w<sup>ch</sup> happens al= most universally when cold & warmth meet anywhere, & particularly in  $y^{\rm e}$  air, for water in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air (mostly) raised by heat, returns to water by cold; & begins by imperceptible dropps, & when those in= crease & by coalescence become large Enough, they appear in clouds, & fall down in rain. It was observed that of small body's,  $y^{\rm e}$  superficies (by  $w^{\rm ch}$ y<sup>e</sup> resistance is applyed) is accordingly in pro=
in proportion to  $y^{\rm e}$  substance (by  $w^{\rm ch}$ y<sup>e</sup> impetus is gaged) much more than in greater bodys; therefore  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  resistance of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air that holds up small things, letts great ones fall, as ye steel suspen= ded in menstruums demonstrate, tho much specifically heavyer than ye li= quor, as water is also than air, there= for y<sup>e</sup> suspension of clouds in y<sup>e</sup> air, notwithstanding their bigg looks, is not to be wondered at. But yet  $y^{\rm e}\ dropps$ that compose  $y^{\text{e}}$  cloud, of  $w^{\text{ch}}$  no one can fall, yet together with  $y^e$  interfering air, w<sup>ch</sup> is in part, confine/e\d amongst them, make one body & may gravitate, tho not according to a solid of that bulk. As if a faggot or spunge were specifically heavyer than water, it wou'd sink & carry all  $y^{\rm e}$  interstitiall water with it, as one intire lump.

This gives

176. causes of y<sup>e</sup> winds

# (484) Physica

This gives me an handle to think, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ preSsing of clouds in a body upon y<sup>e</sup> air may be one cause of winds, for one may discern a great content of maSsy clouds like mighty rocks with  $y^{\rm e}$  sun shining upon them, but underneath as flatt as a trencher, & level as water,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  shews that y<sup>e</sup> air bears y<sup>e</sup> weight of them, & altho they may preSs out some air, they cannot sink much in that manner, & generally speaking it is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fanning of  $y^{\rm e}$  air that lifts & partly holds up some heaps of clouds from sinking. But now having mentioned one cause,  $w^{\rm ch}$  I cannot say is y<sup>e</sup> chief, but only (as I said) condu= cing to winds it is seasonable to look out for  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  head quarters,  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  is a subject that hath tormented y<sup>e</sup> naturalists as much as any. And for that I have 2 conside= rations, first,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  originall cause that excites

excites such a flowing of  $y^{\rm e}$  air, & next,  $y^{\rm e}$ cause of so much violence as we style storm & tempest, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  first, it is enough that  $y^e$  air is a rarefyable & condensible body, as heat & cold contingently falls upon it, & such changes must needs be observed; then upon heat swelling ye air it must dilate, & that will be towards such parts, where are least impediment by mountains & clouds. And  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  body of air once put in motion, hath a vis impreSsa, by  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  it perseveres, till some noncurrent powers obstruct or divert it. Here is enough without more to answer  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  question, whence  $y^{\text{e}}$  winds? to  $w^{\text{ch}}$  I may add  $y^{\text{e}}$  trades,  $w^{\text{ch}}$   $y^{\text{e}}$  $\{\underline{/1/2} \ensuremath{\,\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\,\ensuremath{\,\,\n\&\ensuremath{\,\,\\n\&\n\&\n\&\n\&\ensuremath{\,\,\\n\&\ensuremath{\,\,\\n\&\ensuremath{\,$ drives westward, as y<sup>e</sup> Indian voyagers well know.

But y<sup>e</sup> great enforcements of y<sup>e</sup> common winds whereby they shoot into tempest, is a matter more perplext, & after a compe/tent\ knowledge

{\_}

177. Of tempes= tuous winds

### (486) Physica

knowledge of what accidents of temper & coarctations may happen to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air, it must be left to imagination to form sn Idea of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  various consequence of winds that may happen. For if 2 winds concurr in an acute angle & so become one, that one must accelerate; or if a wind be urgent, & fall into constraint either by clouds, shores, or other winds, by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  rules of hydrology, that wind must exas= perate, & who shall limitt  $y^e$  degrees; Thus there can be no tempest so violent but, considering  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of so great a body in motion, all  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  extreams we know of storms may be reconciled to poSsibillity.

But I think it reasonable to make a distinction between y<sup>e</sup> powers of a bo= dy of air in motion. For there is one sort, that goes beyond all that may be called wind, & that is an aeriall earthquake; I use

178.) Of aeriall earthquakes

I use that term to distinguish those, from ye true earthquakes of ye land itself. I heard a Smirna merchant<sup>212</sup> say, he was upon a house & by y<sup>e</sup> rattling of y<sup>e</sup> tyles heard an earthquake coming, & observed it rattle  $y^{\rm e}$  tyles all along as it came, & so to  $y^e$  place where he stood, & there he was sensible of a great rufling di= sorder, & so it went ratling away & left ye town. And upon inquiry they were informed that other towns in ye dint felt ye same. He sayd ye shipps in ye Bay felt exactly y<sup>e</sup> same, by w<sup>ch</sup> it appears this sort of earthquakes are gradient. These throw down houses more effectually than storms of wind tho very violent. And y<sup>e</sup> difference will be best shewed by a type, that is between a fierce stream & y<sup>e</sup> waves of y<sup>e</sup> sea, y<sup>e</sup> for= mer had never thrown down Winstanelys light house upon  $y^{\rm e}$  Eddistone rock.  $^{\rm 213}$  For y<sup>e</sup> storm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>212</sup> RN's brother Dudley had been a merchant both at Smyrna and Constantinople. This part of the Physica follows quite closely (without the biographical and contextual material) a similarly subtitled episode in the *Life of the Honourable Sir Dudley North, Knt, etc.*, London, 1744 p. 36 ff.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>213</sup> Henry Winstanley (1644-1703), a polymath and entrepreneur and, among other things, proprietor of Mathematical Water Theatre in Piccadilly, designed and built the first lighthouse on the Eddystone Rocks (a reef twelve miles south of the Plymouth Sound in the Channel Approaches). He had himself lost two cargoes in wrecks on the Eddystone. The lighthouse was built in wood in 1696-7, and having suffered damage from storms, was enlarged and refurbished with stone in the following year. The whole of the lighthouse, Winstanley included, for he was visiting it at the time, was swept away by the Great Storm of 1703.

### (488) Physica

y<sup>e</sup> storm or current is steddy one way but y<sup>e</sup> waves do not onely suck & draw backwards & forwards, but lift at y<sup>e</sup> same time, & such is y<sup>e</sup> action of an earthquake; but as to y<sup>e</sup> cause & de= rivation, Latent in tenebris.<sup>214</sup>

And our common turbo's or whirlewinds are all mistery; they (as y° earthquakes) happen in calms, & of these y° action is turbinated but not in y° others w<sup>ch</sup> seem to paSs direct. I was once rufled in one, & saw it cutt like a knife into a watring place of a river, & then, at y° deep, paSsed silently over, & appeared to go on from y° otherside twisting up y° heaves, as it came, so it went, & y° time of y° latent paSsage seemed to agree with its speed afore & after. A vertuoso in y° transactions,<sup>215</sup> mentions his seing a whirlwind come from y° clouds if such observation cou'd be well secon/ded\ it wou'd

179. Of whirl= winds

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>214</sup> i.e., 'remains obscure'.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 215}$  I have been able to find nothing in the Transactions searching on these words.

Physica (4<del>89</del>) 218

it wou'd open a stately inquiry into y<sup>e</sup> cause; But a present we have no Glimps of an efficiency by any conformity's in nature, to furnish out so much as a gueSs at y<sup>e</sup> reason of these phaenomena.

The alliance of y<sup>e</sup> subject invites me here to give an account of what hath come to my knowledge concerning  $y^{\rm e}$  spouts at sea, frequently observed, in y<sup>e</sup> medi= terane. They appear at distance like a column of solid water rising from  $y^{\rm e}$ sea, & determining in cloud; & it is y<sup>e</sup> common opinion, that it is really so,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$ is strange, because nature hath not done y<sup>e</sup> same /like\ in any instance; & what shou'd lift a ponderose maSs in y<sup>e</sup> perpendicu lar right up Sr H. Shears, 216 who had been Engineer at Tangier told me that he went in a veSsell out to sea on purpose to observe them, & made  $y^e$  veSsel go-dir= rectly into one, & by ye symptomes it it appeared

180.
Of spouts
in y<sup>e</sup> medi=
terrane

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>216</sup> Sir Henry Sheres, 1641-1710, naval engineer (he built the mole at Tangiers harbour), member of the Royal Society, friend of Samuel Pepys and, after 1690, suspected Jacobite; author of A Discourse Touching Tangier, London, 1680, and A discourse on the Mediterranean Sea and the Streights of Gibraltar, London, 1703. I have not yet tried to trace the source of this story. Sheres edited two volumes of Sir Walter Raleigh's works and may have been the source for RN's obscure reference to Raleigh's advice on infantry assault in 'of y<sup>e</sup> English Militia', see BL Add MS 32526, fol. 78r.

(490) Physica

appeared to him to be only a great whirle= wind; for  $y^{\rm e}$  ruffle was unaccountable; & he cou'd see a ripple as unaccountable upon  $y^e$  surface of  $y^e$  sea, from  $w^{ch}$  flakes of water were continuously taken up, whirled & twisted about & broken, so that y<sup>e</sup> folks were as wett as if they were dipt, & y<sup>e</sup> sailes flowed water upon y<sup>e</sup> deck as much as y<sup>e</sup> scuppers cou'd well carry off, & so it proceeded, The flaky dropps growing smaller, & by rising in that manner were broke into mist & went away in a cloud. But whence this turbi= nous action came he cou'd not imagine. This is one instance to shew, that in phi= losophy as well as policy, y<sup>e</sup> truth of fact is  $y^{\rm e}$  limit & content of knowledge.

181.
State of
y<sup>e</sup> air with
respect to
wett & dry

But returning to y<sup>e</sup> winds, considering that y<sup>e</sup> different temperatures of cold & warmth (than w<sup>ch</sup> nothing is more con= tingent) meeting & intermixing in y<sup>e</sup> air by y<sup>e</sup> law by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  law of distillation must produce wett; It is no great strain to ye imagina= tion to represent how these changes may happen, for wind of one temper may be aloft, & another below, & laterally, such confining will Eddy & vorticate one into another, & so meeting & interfering all manner of ways, may happen to produce wett, when clear & single winds are allways dry. And it must be taken for granted that whenever in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air a condensation happens by cold, it will subside & make a valley in  $y^e$  Atmosphear, & contrarily heat puffe it up in a protruberance, so that in  $y^{\text{e}}$  main,  $y^{\text{e}}$  Atmosphear, in  $y^{\text{e}}$ regions where these changes happen, is never prefectly levell but, more or leSs, allways rising or falling, Except at some stationary times, as when/en\ we have steddy weather. So that in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  generalls

condensations

(492) Physica

condensations are productive of wett,  $\ensuremath{\&}$ rarefactions of dry weather. And there are folks that by much observation of symptomes, & consequences in y<sup>e</sup> air, have acquired a skill of gueSsing at future weather, & sometimes, tho farr from allways, and indeed not very often succeed. And many contrivances, as Thermometers, Hydrascopes, Salt strings, &  $y^{\rm e}$  like have been used to discover humidity in  $y^{\text{e}}$  air,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  I cannot say are, in foretelling changes of weather, much to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  purpose, for many saylors, shepherds & other persons imployed mostly abroad by a sort of habit in gueSsing, wou'd, till lately) have farr out gone ye philosophers & all their machinerys.

Of the Barometer.

But now by an application of y<sup>e</sup> Torri= cellian experiment, a surer prognostick of weather is obtained, than ever was dreamt of in y<sup>e</sup> world before. And this

is y<sup>e</sup>

182.
Of y<sup>e</sup> Tor=
ricallian
experim<sup>t</sup>
& y<sup>e</sup> baro=
meter.

is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Mercuriall Barometer; an instrum^t: that from being a curiosity in ye philoso= phick schools, is become, like clocks, a furniture for /in\ most mens houses. The ma= teriall & fabrick is so well known, that I need not stay to describe it, nor be con= cerned into how many forms artists have disposed it, for all amounts to ye same; w<sup>ch</sup> is only that a column of Mercury, in a long tube inverted in Mercury, without any air escaping into it, will fall untill  $y^{\rm e}$  crowding of  $y^{\rm e}$  air upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  mettall in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  cisterne below, tending to drive it up into  $y^e$  tube, is ballanced by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  weight of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  mettall that is in it, tending to discent into  $y^e$  cisterne. So here is force against weight,  $w^{\rm ch}\; {\rm will}\; not\; {\rm rest}$ but in a ballance of equallity. There= fore  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  immediate indication is, that if ye mercury in ye tube riseth, ye crowding upon y<sup>e</sup> stagnum (as it is called) in y<sup>e</sup> cist=/terne\ becomes

# (494) Physica

becomes stronger, & if that in y<sup>e</sup> tube sinks, it argues a diminution of y<sup>e</sup> preSsure upon y<sup>e</sup> stagnum below. Therefore it remaines only to consider y<sup>e</sup> state & condition of this compreSsure that operates upon y<sup>e</sup> stagnum, & there= by lifts, & supplys y<sup>e</sup> mercury in y<sup>e</sup> tube. As for y<sup>e</sup> history & experiments relating to this discovery, they are a large, field, & not to be taken into this de sign w<sup>ch</sup> is to follow y<sup>e</sup> pure facts, & prognostication of weather expected from it.

The measure of this preSsure is styled y<sup>e</sup> superimpending column, but impro= perly, for y<sup>e</sup> force is derived from all parts, as well laterall as upwright, but in regard y<sup>e</sup> whole Atmosphear is incumbent upon y<sup>e</sup> whole face of y<sup>e</sup> earth, Each part bears his share, w<sup>ch</sup> is equall to y<sup>e</sup> column, as a proportion & not

183. Of y<sup>e</sup> ee co= lumn & y<sup>t</sup> rules y<sup>e</sup> weight of y<sup>e</sup> air {\_}}

Physica (495) 221

& not a precise weight. It was observed ye weight of ye air diminisheth upwards, because  $y^{\text{e}}$  quantity preSsing is leSs, in  $y^{\text{e}}$ proportion of squares: And accordingly raising y<sup>e</sup> instrument locally in perpen= diculo, detracts from  $y^{\rm e}$  length & /so\ also from  $y^e$  weight o{<u>f y<sup>e</sup> /aeriall</u>} column, {<u>& l</u>}etts y<sup>e</sup> Mercury in y<sup>e</sup> tube sink, & a lowering ye instrument raiseth it; by w<sup>ch</sup> means some have pretended to calculate nearly y<sup>e</sup> perpendicular height of mountains. The magnitude of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  tube hath no son= sequence, for one as wide as a barrell works  $y^{\rm e}$  same as one 1/4 inch wide. for it is a rule in hydrostaticks, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ force of fluids preSsing is as y<sup>e</sup> apperture, & here is but one apperture  $w^{\rm ch}$  is com= mon to both, w<sup>ch</sup> makes y<sup>e</sup> forces always alike, &  $\{/to\}$  increase & diminish together. It is usuall in  $y^{\rm e}$  printed discourses of ma=

ny of y<sup>e</sup> vertuosi, Especially of y<sup>e</sup> medicall faculty

{\_}
184.
Of y<sup>e</sup>
weight of

y<sup>e</sup> air wett & dry (496) Physica

faculty to meet it observed, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air was at certain times heavy or light. But such expreSsion is insensible; for if they mean a power to raise  $y^{\rm e}$  Mer= cury, & suppose it to proceed from hu= midity intermixt with  $y^{\rm e}$  air, it is er= roneous, for it is lowest, (generally) in mo/i\st air, & higest in dry, when  $\{\underline{too}\}$  y<sup>e</sup> air is thought to be lightest. If they woud note when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air preSseth most or least, or (w^{ch} is  $y^{\rm e}$  same thing) let them say when  $y^{\rm e}$  air is strongest or weakest, & then make y<sup>e</sup> best of their remarques. But I know  $y^{\rm e}$  common opinion is that moist air, by vertue of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water that is in it, is specifically heavyer, than when it is dry; yet our chief virtuosi affirm theres is no difference of such specifick weight by any experiment they have made to be discovered. However  $y^{\text{e}}$  matter imports not, for  $y^{\text{e}}$  spring of  $y^{\text{e}}$ air

{\_}}

air is actuated by other means than wett & dry, altho those conditions may happen in consequence of what will affect  $y^{\rm e}$  spring.

It is next to be considered, what is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  true efficient cause of ye increase or abate= ment of ye preSsure or spring of ye air, referred to any thing in a fixt place. And as to this matter, I do insist that  $y^e$  cause is wholly by a coacerva= tion & concavation of  $y^{\rm e}$  superior At= mosphear, & nothing else; That is when by any means  $y^{\rm e}$  summit of it is lifted up, as a rising country above  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  common levell, then (by force of addition) y<sup>e</sup> preS= sure is increas't, & on  $y^{\rm e}$  other side when a valley is excavated below ye same le= vell, then (by  $y^e$  substraction of so much) y<sup>e</sup> preSsure is relieved; for by Hydrostatick philosophy, it is determined that fluids preSs

185. Raising or de= preSsing y<sup>e</sup> Atmos= phear only af= fects y<sup>e</sup> column (498) Physica

preSs & have force according to  $y^{\rm e}$  per= pendicular gage, as all experiments have approved. If it be said, that above where y<sup>e</sup> matter thus accumulated or excavated may be of a sort of more rare & not so ponderous as  $y^{\text{e}}$  rest; I answer that  $\{\underline{that}\}$  y<sup>e</sup> account will be y<sup>e</sup> same; for y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear is a body like water, [+&?] (perhaps) as much distin= guished from Aether, as that as is from air, & all  $y^{\rm e}$  matter in its limits whi= ther interstitiall or other, make good  $y^{\text{e}}$  fullneSs, & preSs upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  base, but grant that a parcell of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  lower air tran/n\Slated (as in a bladder) to  $y^{\rm e}$  sum= mitt of y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear, woud weight & incline to fall more than  $y^{\rm e}$  rest that is there; yet  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  addition or diminution of air tho most rarefyed may signify leSs, yet it will have some, but (perhaps/aps\) not so

{\_}}

186 How y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear is raised or depreSsed Physica (4<del>99</del>) 223

not so much effect upon  $y^{\rm e}$  mercury be= low but according to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  proper force of it. This fluctuation at y<sup>e</sup> surface of y<sup>e</sup> At= mosphear can be caused by nothing but bu condensation & rarefaction, & those can happen only by means of adventitious cold, or heat; & those quallitys can by no means arrive, but by ye winds, ye contin= gency of  $w^{\rm ch},$  whereupon all the rest de= pend, is well known. It is certain that if a cold air interferes with a warmer, either above, below, laterallyor other= wise, y<sup>e</sup> latter must undergo condensa= tion, & consequently shrink into leSs room, & so lett down a valley in  $y^{\rm e}$  At= mosphear; & contrarily, if a warm air fall among cold, that must rarefy, & puff up ye Atmosphear. But these states are not of long continuance, un= leSs y<sup>e</sup> causes continue, but y<sup>e</sup> extravagants immediately tend towards a resettlement in y<sup>e</sup>

(500) Physica

in y<sup>e</sup> proper levell. Now it is a capitall inquiry, how y<sup>e</sup> winds as to cold & heat Acquire such different tempers, & what means shou'd produce such various & im= portune marches fiercer & milder as we have experience of them; of all w<sup>ch</sup> we may gather somewhat of observa= tion in generall; but as to particulars, we are left to work by imagination & reflection, w<sup>ch</sup> go not further than than poSsi= billitys, or perhaps probabillitys.

And as to these researches, we must look into y<sup>e</sup> wide world, & there we find that all heats about y<sup>e</sup> globe come from y<sup>e</sup> sun, & that very unequally both as to place & time. As first y<sup>e</sup> alternations of heat & cold between night & day, but those follow so fast one upon another, that y<sup>e</sup> consequences are slight; Then y<sup>e</sup> middle Latitudes upon w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> sun never shines directly, have leS heat, than y<sup>e</sup> tropicalls,

of y<sup>e</sup> globe as to heat & cold

184. The state

tropicalls, &  $y^{\rm e}$  Articks home to  $y^{\rm e}$  poles have least of all, but on ye contrary in= tense cold. And /to\ these  $_{\ensuremath{\textit{\tiny 0}}}$  add that all parts are warmer & colder viciSsim.<sup>217</sup> And from these conditions we inferr that /all\ travellering  $a {\tt n} ir \ carrys$  with it  $y^e$  temper of  $y^e$  place, from whence, after some stay, it came. And waiving nice distinctions in these dis= courses for all cold winds I shall use ye term north, & for warm, south, leaving y<sup>e</sup> intermediate points to supposition. And accordingly I conclude that no  ${\tt mNorth}$ wind can be warm, Nor south, cold. But in regard we find by experience, that some cold winds will come, as our wea= ther cocks shew, directly from y<sup>e</sup> south, & warmth often from  $y^{\rm e}$  North, I gather that those are not genuine or true winds, but such as are incidentally diverted from their proper course; And those I shall call reflex

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>217</sup> i.e., 'in turn'.

(502) Physica

reflex winds, whereof  $y^e$  propertys shall be touched afterwards.

We are to consider next that y<sup>e</sup> northern air is allways more condensed than ye southern, & that in measure as  $y^{\rm e}$  difference of  $y^{\rm e}$ tempers, & on  $y^{\rm e}$  other side  $y^{\rm e}$  Southern by rarefaction is more dilated than/an that of  $y^{\text{e}}$  North, therefore whenever  $y^{\text{e}}$  air of  $y^{\text{e}}$ North is by y<sup>e</sup> winds brought Southward, it swell's & makes y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear Gibbous, & when  $y^{\rm e}$  Southern air is conveyed into colder regions, that is, more Northwards, it shrinks, & makes a valley in  $y^e$  At= mosphear, & these consequences are most manifestly by  $y^{\rm e}$  rising & falling of  $y^{\rm e}$ Mercury in  $y^{\rm e}$  Brometrick tube,  $w^{\rm ch}$  is a direct experiment to declare it. Therefore whenever  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  Mercury riseth much, it may be concluded that ye air of ye regi= on is Northern, & so persevering, however  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ weather

188, Winds in= dicated by y<sup>e</sup> Ba= rometer Physica (<del>503</del>) 225

weather cock stands, it will soon be where ye instrument stands. And ye falling of an high Mercury with perseverence,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$ wind standing North, is a certain sign that it is then coming about to  $y^e$  South. And this is  $y^{\rm e}$  grand & immediate indica= tion we have by  $y^e$  Mercury, & most to be depended on. And a noble discovery it is, when by a petit utensill in  $y^e$  cor= ner of a cabanet, y<sup>e</sup> immense changes of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  tone of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  aire over whole regions, & nations upon  $y^{\rm e}$  earth, with  $y^{\rm e}$  prevai= ling winds, or like to succeed, by  $y^e$  ri= sing & falling of  $y^{\rm e}$  Mercury in  $y^{\rm e}$  space of about two or three inches, are vis= bly marked. And in consequence of this very same experiment, we come to know  $y^{\rm e}$  condition of  $y^{\rm e}$  air we breathe,  $y^{\rm e}$ Atmosphear, & more naturall philosophy than y<sup>e</sup> Greeks ever dreamt of.

But

189, Wett & dry affect y<sup>e</sup> Baro= meter

### (4504) Physica

But we must not stop at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  winds for y<sup>e</sup> greatest expectation is is of a prog= nostick of weather, as to wett & dry, be= cause that is of use w<sup>ch</sup> may turn to pro= fit. And seeing ye Barometer by its be= haviour in those respects rising & falling hath given occasion sufficient to inti= tule it  $K\alpha\tau^{}{}^{\prime}\zeta\xi o\chi\eta^{}{}^{\prime}\nu$  , The Weather GlaSs:218 I must enter upon y<sup>e</sup> spatious field; I mean to give an account of y<sup>e</sup> various succeSses of that sort, & as they have hap= pened to credit or discredit y<sup>e</sup> instrument. And herein, I shall be forced to step /much\ in ye dark, because ye indications are se= condary & not primary; & consequently more vacillatory or inconstant. There= fore as a staff to aid y<sup>e</sup> stepping, [I?] must use y<sup>e</sup> naked observations abroad, that Joyned with ye movement of ye Mercury  $w^{ch}$  are but simply up & de/o\wn. And so

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>218</sup> Following his Moderns *versus* Ancients comment at the foot of the previous page, MN exercises his Greek language skills (and tests ours).

## Physica

(<del>4505</del>) 226

And so perhaps gain a tollerable pre= diction of y<sup>e</sup> weather. And I must be excused for using y<sup>e</sup> foregoing hypo= thesis thro'out. For in such obscurity we can never find a way to any cer= tainty of principle, w<sup>ch</sup> makes it ne= ceSsary to move by analogys, w<sup>ch</sup> pro= ving conformable in y<sup>e</sup> chief, may be trusted in y<sup>e</sup> inferior instances. I think our best Method will be, to set down y<sup>e</sup> rules of y<sup>e</sup> Barometer, by way of aphorism, & then for confir= mation add such commentations as shall seem proper.

1. The rising of y<sup>e</sup> Mercury is a sign of dry weather, & y<sup>e</sup> falling of y<sup>e</sup> contrary. This is y<sup>e</sup> most generall rule of y<sup>e</sup> instru= ment, & for y<sup>e</sup> most part holds well, for condensation of y<sup>e</sup> air, w<sup>ch</sup> is always brought about by cold, fills it with humid dropps, w<sup>ch</sup> coalescent, as must follow

190, Aphorismes of y<sup>e</sup> Ba= rometer

# (506) Physica

follow if y<sup>e</sup> condensation proceeds, or continues, will fall in rain, or at least become misty, or cloudy, w<sup>ch</sup> without more, corresponds y<sup>e</sup> symptome, for humidity in y<sup>e</sup> air may not allways turn to rain, Nor be determined to more or leSs certein= ty, but according to circumstances.

2. In both rising & falling of  $y^e$  Mer= cury,  $y^e$  quickneSs or dullneSs of  $y^e$  mo= tion, is of more signification, than  $y^e$ space moved. It is to be found by experience that very quick motions seldom, or, in some mea= sure at least, never fail of a confor= mable succeSs, for it shews  $y^e$  cause, whatever it is, acts powerfully.

3. In settled weather &  $y^e$  Mercury standing long in a place, no change of weather can come without a con= siderable notice beforehand by some movement.

Physica (<del>4507</del>) 227

For here is no croSs working of causes one over another  $w^{ch}$  must create incerteinty, but a single cause that must precede some time before  $y^e$ effect can follow, for be it  $ag^{st}$ rain,  $y^e$  valley will be formed, be= fore  $y^e$  dropps coalesce so as to be sen= sible.

4. In such case, if  $y^e$  motion stopps suddenly, & then returns towards  $y^e$ same station, it is a sign  $y^e$  same weather will continue. For towards rain as before, in  $y^e$ time between  $y^e$  /valley &\ coalescence of  $y^e$ dropps { $\pm$ } $y^e$  latter is prevented by a restitution of  $y^e$  former state.

5. If y<sup>e</sup> alteration stands long & be considerable, there is certainly an effect somewhere. This is y<sup>e</sup> greatest infelicity of y<sup>e</sup> instrum/t for

{\_}

(508)

for effects are not always extended as y<sup>e</sup> cause is; for that shall be y<sup>e</sup> same all over England, giving signs of wett weather, & no effect locally appear, but it shall be known by report that in remote countrys, there had been great rains or snows, But this happens not often, & for y<sup>e</sup> most part, y<sup>e</sup> effects answer y<sup>e</sup> symptomes every where; however this use may be made, that when y<sup>e</sup> signes are e= gregious there is reason to conclude there are great effects somewhere, & it is probable that all places, in time will partake of y<sup>e</sup>them.

Physica

6. When  $y^e$  signs are not answered, it is a sign that  $y^e$  same weather will continue, & that  $y^e$  Mercury will return to its post, but still sub= ject to effects in places remote.

This

Physica (<del>4509</del>) 228

This coincides with  $y^e$  former, &  $y^e$  like is observed of  $y^e$  naked sympromes abroad, for when  $y^e$  clouds threaten in a dry time, as if rain were coming, & none follows, it is a token that  $y^e$  drought will continue, Especially if  $y^e$  Mer= cury, hangs back, & makes little or no steps towards a change.

7. High Mercury & North winds, & low with Southwinds are naturall, but y<sup>e</sup> alternate, Low Mercury with North & high Mercury with Southwinds I term non naturall. It was observed before that y<sup>e</sup> cold air coming from y<sup>e</sup> Northern regions, towards y<sup>e</sup> Southern, accumulated, & y<sup>e</sup> alternate depreSsed y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear. W<sup>ch</sup> appears manifestly in y<sup>e</sup> Barometer, for that constantly riseth & falls with y<sup>e</sup> winds, [....?] w<sup>ch</sup> I take {/stet} y<sup>e</sup> alledged to be y<sup>e</sup> sole cause [....?],<sup>219</sup> I mean rarefaction & conden= sation: Dr Halley who allows y<sup>e</sup> alterations of y<sup>e</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>219</sup> The text between the two bracketed trails of dots has been washed-out and overwritten. It is not absolutely clear that it was then *subsequently* crossed out, the pencilled-in 'stet' might indicate that RN, or whoever it was annotating the text, read the marks left by the washing-out and overwritting as a crossing-out!

Physica

5<del>0</del>10

of y<sup>e</sup> Atmosphear to be hydrostatick, & yet aSigns y<sup>e</sup> cause upon y<sup>e</sup> winds, w<sup>ch</sup> meeting raise, & deviding depreSs y<sup>e</sup> surface. But I do not agree with him in that, for y<sup>e</sup> air is so open, & unconfined, that if contrary currents meet, that will divert laterally easyer then accumulate, for that can happen only in a channel. And then this accumulation or devision, if any such happened in an even tem= pered air had no effect upon y<sup>e</sup> weather; but twhen it comes by condensation & rarefaction it toucheth y<sup>e</sup> weather & y<sup>e</sup> Barometer at y<sup>e</sup> same time & unites y<sup>e</sup> symptomes with y<sup>e</sup> effect.

8. The naturall produceth fair, & y<sup>e</sup> non naturall foul weather. As for examples; If y<sup>e</sup> wind be North & y<sup>e</sup> Mercury low, it is a most sure sign of moist weather, unleSs y<sup>e</sup> Mercury riseth swift. So if y<sup>e</sup> wind be South & y<sup>e</sup> Mercury high Physica (<del>511</del>) 229

high, it may be dry, but always (if not wett) it is either cloudy, windy, or both, & never holds in quiet weather. But y<sup>e</sup> other non na= turall is more humid, because y<sup>e</sup> whole operation is condensing, & this hath some share of rarefaction.

9 Winds North & high Mercury, if shifting tho' in ye Northerly points, ye air will be wett or cloudy. The instrument is defamed because some= times it contradicts it self, as in this case, therefore to do right, ye state of ye air abroad shou'd always, be considered toge= ther with ye Mercury, for in some states of ye winds & ye non naturall cases, expec= tations built upon ye general rule, will fail. And thse shiftings as from North to No#/or\th West, & so to North east, East, or North again, are not without commixtures of differently tempered air. If none comes over

(512). Physica

over from warmer points, & not discerned,  $w^{\rm ch}$  produce wett tho  $y^{\rm e}$  Mercury is in  $y^{\rm e}$  up= per storys.^{220}

 $<sup>^{220}</sup>$  The rest of this page and the following twelve pages have been left blank - except for MN's numbering and header. The BM curators have not given the sheets folio numbers.

Physica (513)

(514) Physica

Physica (515),

(516) Physica

Physica (517)

(518) Physica
Physica (519)

(520) Physica

Physica (521)

(522) Physica

Physica (523)

(524) Physica

230r

191. Of Thun= der storms

# Physica (<del>525</del>) 230

## Of Thunder & Lightning

Of all  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  phaenomena of nature none is so exposed to common sense & observation, & withall none so tremendous to all; & fatall to some, & yet leSs understood, or honoured with a tollerable solution by any of our philosophers, thn ye ordina= ry thunder & lightning. That of Carte= sius, by strata of clouds, falling upon each other, is redicolous. The latter ora=  ${\tt cle^{221}}$  says nothing of  $y^{\tt e}$  matter;  ${\tt D^r}.$  Wallis in  $y^{\text{e}}\xspace$  transactions  $^{222}\xspace$  say's only that somewhat like gunpowder, as Nitre, sulphur, &c come together, & with help of a little moisture, accend & explode. That such materialls are in y<sup>e</sup> air, who doubts? But hath any one shewed what brings them together at certein times, & in such consistencys, as shall have such outrageous effects,

as are

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>221</sup> i.e., Isaac Newton.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>222</sup> John Wallis, 1616-1703 was a mathematician and held the Savilian Chair of Geometry at Oxford from 1649 until his death. 'A Letter of Dr. Wallis to Dr. Sloane, Concerning the Generation of Hail, and of Thunder and Lightning, and the Effects Thereof', Phil. Trans. 1695-1697, 19, 653-8, esp. p. 655 (see: http://rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/19/215-235/653.full.pdf+html? sid=34ad6a77-81de-462b-aecf-271f6d7089b8)

(526) Physica

as are notorious? I knew  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  body of a great timber oak torn to chipps & filaments &  $y^{\rm e}$  head dropt with out a leaf toucht,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  for ought that hath been discovered yet, must seem (as it were) impoSsible; Historicall relations supply innumerable instances of unaccountable effects in such storms, of w<sup>ch</sup>,  $y^e \ y^e$  profusion of rain, & hail stones of surprising magnitudes, as it were shott against  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ground, are not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  most amazing. And slighter effects than these are sufficient to require of all y<sup>e</sup> courtiers of physicall know= ledge, to make continuall & severe in= spections into such flaming misterys; whereby (perhaps) some persons may be eased of their exceSsive, concern  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  upon these occasions torments them, by shewing that  $y^{\rm e}$  forces are naturall, & hurt very few. And from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  influences no defence can be hadfound or had above ground.

I intend

I intend to venture forth a thought or two, w<sup>ch</sup> together with what will be es= teemd more common, may come neerer a solution than is yet known.

The genes[ $\dots$ ?]is of thunderstorms are most in calmes (next y<sup>e</sup> soyle) & made by oppo= sition & commixture of divers winds aloft of a very contrarient temperature. Some extream warm, & others cold in like extremity, wherein respect is had to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ordinary tempers in common weather; & these quallitys are contingent as y<sup>e</sup> winds, of  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  there may be a concurrence of many to exasperate  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  disorder. The heat is for y<sup>e</sup> most part felt below, as when we say it is sultry, & expect a storm, &  $y^{\rm e}$  cold is above, verifyed by  $y^{\rm e}$ quantitys of ice ingendered there. And that in such conjunctionsures there must be very great condensations (w^{ch} increase as y<sup>e</sup> suns heat is deprived by accumula/tions\ of them

192. The gene= rall cause by conden= sation

## (528) Physica

of them) is neceSsary from such opposi= tions, but y<sup>e</sup> very view declares as much for it is usually seen how y<sup>e</sup> clouds in= crease, & roll about, as driven with di= verse winds. And if we cou'd discern more of y<sup>e</sup> clouds than y<sup>e</sup> inferior parts, & pe= netrate into y<sup>e</sup> volumes above, we sho:<sup>d</sup> have better information of y<sup>e</sup> state there, than we can have below, where we can only gueSs at y<sup>e</sup> rest.

And if we may be allowed to launch out in that track, we must conceive that y<sup>e</sup> cloudy collection is immensly extended every way. If I say'd some miles long, broad & deep, it wou'd not be much out of y<sup>e</sup> way, And this not all in a lump as one common mist, such as we often have a view of Laterally, when y<sup>e</sup> storm is over; But continually moving & toSsing in heaps one way & other, & full of ducts & cavitys, w<sup>ch</sup> are always, by closing

193. Of y<sup>e</sup> man= ner, & how thunder closing & opening in change, & where  $y^{\rm e}$ clouds {were} preSst together by winds, they may open & make a cavity, & that turn to a duct & close again. And  $y^e$  air in  $y^{\rm e}$  cavity may be cold or hot, & in  $y^{\rm e}$ ducts, diriven with impetuous force, & perhaps meet, w<sup>ch</sup> must create as was said extraordinary condensations, & dis= tillations of water, w<sup>ch</sup> prove frozen, or mixt, some wett, some Ice  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  begins with snow, & that hurryed with winds become hail,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  in such state increase & are not permitted to discend, till (quan= tity (increast) will endure it no longer, and then it comes down alltogether in sheets of hail, & those not derived from ye low= er, but perhaps y<sup>e</sup> highest orders of clouds, & falling thro all, are in y<sup>e</sup> paSsage {<u>ever</u>  $\underline{viol}\} \texttt{enced}$  , & gather continually. Now conidering these extreams, It is obvious to imagine that when either  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  weighty bodys

232r

{\_}

{\_}}

(530) Physica

bodys of clouds are by contrary winds compreSst together, or by any accensi= ons happening in y<sup>e</sup> cavitys, y<sup>e</sup> air com= preSst within (for tho clouds are made up of distinct dropps, yet they, with  $y^{\rm e}$  in= terstitiall air, make one body, & mostly come & go together) will produce Erup= tions; And {() when these are with  $vie/io\lence{}$ to cause accension or lightning, There will succeed a fragor that receiving augmentation below, is terrible to all creatures. And first,  $y^{\rm e}$  sound is increas't by coming from high, or thinner air, down to an air more dense as it is at  $y^{\text{e}}$  earth, & then  $y^{\text{e}}$  Ecchos not only from among  $y^{\rm e}$  clouds, & against  $y^{\rm e}$  strata or heaps of them, but between ye clouds & y<sup>e</sup> earth perpetually rebounding to & fro till  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  force of it is wasted; & this makes  $y^{\text{e}}$  sound,  $y^{\text{e}}$  is but  $y^{\text{e}}$  strokes from ye Eruptions, continuing & seeming to roll from

{\_}}

from one place to another & ceasing by degrees, not unlike a meer Eccho.

But y<sup>e</sup> more transcendent inquiry is of  $y^{\rm e}$  lightning & its forces, & manner of stri= king. The configuration of it appea= rance is to be observed, some may think that y<sup>e</sup> darting to & fro is as a train fired, w<sup>ch</sup> seems to run as a progreSsive [....?]fire, but upon consideration, I think this is not so, for  $y^{\text{e}}$  going & returning, as it doth often by long stretches, seems too swift for that course, w<sup>ch</sup> wou'd take more time to paSs, & repaSs such lengths, as we see in starrs shooting & falling. Therefore I repute  $y^{\rm e}$  lightning to be pure & pute eruption. And not altogether of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  form as it appears by  $y^{\rm e}$  acute-angle returns, for however  $y^{\rm e}$  returns too & from are,  $y^{\rm e}$ perspective view of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  under parts of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ clouds will make them seem acute-angled,

& sometimes

233r

194. Of light= night & its forces

## (532) Physica

& sometimes  $y^e$  whole eruption angular= ly figured, shall appear, as in  $y^e$  same instant, & how farr it is from us or how near, tis impossible, for want of comparatives, for us to judge.

I once saw a kind of light column, distinct, distinct from y<sup>e</sup> other lightning reching from y<sup>e</sup> cloud to y<sup>e</sup> ground, w<sup>ch</sup> might be a blast, wherever it fell, such as melts mettalls or does worse mis chief; But that w<sup>ch</sup> rends trees seems to be not y<sup>e</sup> lightning or any emanation from it, but a formed consistence of spirituous explosive matter, w<sup>ch</sup> in y<sup>e</sup> violence of y<sup>e</sup> eruptions, (being as I suppose formed in y<sup>e</sup> cavitys of y<sup>e</sup> clouds, & so strays about till it meets of a con= juncture to give fire to it, as y<sup>e</sup> styptick sap of an oak is like to do) hath a gunpowder effect as was noted. And it

is not

## Physica (<del>533</del>) 234

is not unlikely that many accendible coagulums, may paSs about unseen, & not mee= ting with such opposition, or other means to fire them, fail of that event, & as Ice, diSsolve, & come to air again as they were before. As for y<sup>e</sup> storys of melting a sword & not hurting y<sup>e</sup> scabbard /& y<sup>e</sup> like\ y<sup>e</sup> /there wants som vi=\ [....?]there wants a sen=<sup>223</sup> sible proof to perswade they can be so, for y<sup>e</sup> melted mettall woud soon consume y<sup>e</sup> scabbard.

195. How y<sup>e</sup> ac= cendible spi= rits collected { <u>operations</u>}

But yet y<sup>e</sup> principall secret remains un= disclosed, & that is y<sup>e</sup> collection, & accension of y<sup>e</sup> inflammable spirits among y<sup>e</sup> clouds, where y<sup>e</sup> {greatest} are to distill water, w<sup>ch</sup> doth not well consist with fiery accensions. My conceipt of y<sup>e</sup> matter is this; It is well known that together with y<sup>e</sup> abundance of water raised up into y<sup>e</sup> common are by heat, there is mixed with it not a little of adust parts of y<sup>e</sup> spirituous kind, as a suphur, Nitre, &c such as come

 $^{223}$  Two possible versions have been left - and both are written over an earlier washed-out version.

(534) Physica

as come by smoak, & culinary, as well as other exhalations. Amidst  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  tempestuous clouds, there is not only vast compreSsion but mighty condensations, w<sup>ch</sup> latter draw from  $y^{\rm e}$  air as well interstitiall, as in  $y^{\rm e}$ cavitys of  $y^{\text{e}}$  cloud, mightys quantitys of humid matter producing those orages of rain & hail that seem in short tempes= tuous gatherings to fall from them. The watery parts by coalesccence increase & fall, leaving  $y^{\rm e}$  spirituous part,  $w^{\rm ch}$  will not, like water, coalesce so as to fall. And hereby y<sup>e</sup> intercloudy air becomes mostly spirituous & accendible, & in that is like to vapours, as they are called, in mines, & subterraneous cavitys, where ye sulphureous habitus of  $y^{\text{e}}$  earth fills  $y^{\text{e}}$ air of those places; it being all one whi= ther  $y^{\rm e}$  spirits are copiously, (as in  $y^{\rm e}\ damps)$ infused into  $y^{\text{e}}$  air, or  $y^{\text{e}}$  air (as in  $y^{\text{e}}$  clouds) be by

Physica (535) 235

be by distillation discharged of great part of water leaving  $y^{\text{e}}$  spirit; both  $y^{\text{e}}$  one &  $y^{\rm e}$  other for parallell cause become in= flammable. And in y<sup>e</sup> mines it is common for  $y^{\text{e}}$  damps to kindle at a stroke of  $y^{\text{e}}$  hack against a stone, or by fire designedly applyed, & not seldom by other unknown accidents. And why shoud not ye hsame happen in like manner by accident a= mong y<sup>e</sup> tempestuous clouds; This is enough to shew that it is no wonder that tempes= tuary air shou'd take fire, & appear to us by lightning. And to bring y<sup>e</sup> matter to a nearer familiarity, how often do we complain of stinking mists? No water is sweeter than that from  $y^{\rm e}$  clouds. The rea= son of such stenches is that such air; however it comes/omes\ to us, hath much of  $y^e$ aqueous parts distilled into dropps, & much perhaps fallen to  $y^{\rm e}$  earth, &  $y^{\rm e}$  rest that is left consists partly of sulphur &c  $w^{\rm ch}$  stinks wherever

## (536) Physica

wherever it comes) mixt with  $y^e$  remaining air. And if  $y^e$  experiment coud be tryed; & a large extebt of sulphureous air in a common stinking mist be hard pent,, & let go at narrow crevises, I shoud be loath to stand  $y^e$  fire for  $y^e$  very quick motion & friction woud kindle it.

Here is a reason enough to satisfy one, how y<sup>e</sup> air among tempestuous clouds may be accendible, but how it is actually kin= dled, is matter of further consideration. Some have thought of spirits opposite in nature, w<sup>ch</sup> put together will grow hot & kindle, & some salts with y<sup>e</sup> addition of a little water, & so lime readily burns; The Phosphorus (new) will kindle in meer air; & other like accensions are (on these occasions) mentioned. I must allow them all & more that are unknown to be poSsi= bilitys, & cannot say negatively that any of them are excluded from being concerned

in y<sup>e</sup> operation

196, How y<sup>e</sup> mat= ter of light= ning is ac= cended

in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  operation of lightning. but my senti= ment is that  $y^{\rm e}$  common, & most frequent & effectual cause is, friction. If y<sup>e</sup>we ima= gine that in a cavity of y<sup>e</sup> clouds com= preSst,  $y^{\rm e}$  air by any of  $y^{\rm e}$  aforesaid acci= dents shall take fire, there is no doubt but there will be an eruption,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  to us will be as lightning, & how often it may happen so, I cannot pronounce. But if from such compreSsure there followeth an eruption of sulphureous air, then without any other means of accension but by meer swiftneSs & snatching of y<sup>e</sup> current against  $y^{\text{e}}$  stated & unmoved air of  $y^{\text{e}}$  clou'd, it will take fire, &  $y^{\rm e}$  manner of its shooting to & fro, seems to argue for this explication. There is nothig further as Icknow to pro= voke our conjectures, but ye nature of those transparent bodys they call fire balls, w<sup>ch</sup> are supposed to paSs harmleSs un= till some accident fires them & then they blow



blow thro all. Gunpowder is too groSs to aSsist an Idea of them; It is not certain they enter thro walls, but it is more pro= bable, that such encounters might fire them. Therefore it is adviseable to stand clear of paSsages. Harmes often happen in y<sup>e</sup> fields w<sup>ch</sup> I take to be jaculation from y<sup>e</sup> clouds upon y<sup>e</sup> eruptions, rather than any matter that takes fire near them. And the fire balls, as they are called, seem to be collected & composed in  $y^{\rm e}$  cloudy regions and blown towards  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth, rather than gathered so low. Some think that lightning is transient as in a train, but it seems that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  appearance is more in divers parts instantaneous than suits that resolve, but rather agrees with Eruption, altho even that, as a rent, may shew y<sup>e</sup> appearance of a transit,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is too nimble for shew/uch\ exceeding swift darting & such lengths as are observed.



 $<sup>^{224}</sup>$  The pencilled annotation, marking a section with a verticle line and annoted 'Ante' suggests that it should be inserted earlier in the chapter.

## Of Curuscations.

I mentioned elsewhere that thunder storms often concluded in harmleSs coruscations; And now springs a temptation to examine a little more scrupulously into  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  causes of such effects; I mean y<sup>e</sup> various sorts of Lumens, w<sup>ch</sup> stike our sense, but without fire or sensible warmth. The vertuosi have observed severall of them, but without so much as proffering to resolve their efficients; & I am not a little piqued upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  subjects, because  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  scheme of litght & colours,  $w^{\rm ch}$  I have proposed, will be very imperfect, without a supplemen= tary explanation of these sub lumina. In order to w<sup>ch</sup> I must remember that y<sup>e</sup> former supposed that y<sup>e</sup> action of y<sup>e</sup> sun, & leSser fires impreSst  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole intermediate fluid, as well  $y^{\rm e}$  groSs, as  $y^{\rm e}$  more minute interstitiall

197. Of corus= cations & how dis= tinguish't

## (540) Physica

interstitiall matter, but  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  latter only found its way to ye optick nerves, & so ex= cited our Idea of of light, but  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm GroSs}\ {\rm af=}$ fected only  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  exterior parts of our bodys, & raised no other Ideas, but those of heat or burning, in caSe  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  action pointed with force sufficient, as by lent glaSses, or con= cave mettalls. Now here ye segregation of these powers are made at y<sup>e</sup> eye, w<sup>ch</sup> letts in  $y^{\text{e}}$  one & that is conveyed by  $y^{\text{e}}$  subtile matter, & excludes  $y^{\rm e}$  othr  $w^{\rm ch}$  tends to fire rather than light. Therefore if there be an action w<sup>ch</sup> works (almost) wholly upon ye subtile matter of ye medium, & not (much) upon  $y^{\text{e}}\xspace$  groSs, tht will affect  $y^{\text{e}}\xspace$  sence with ye Idea of light without any con= sequence of heat,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  had little or no share in ye cause & wch arose not from any ac= cension, but from a more retired princi= ple. So that common light comes attended with a principle of fire, but coruscation by an action intromitted to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sence, without any ten=

Physica (541) 238 any tendency to fire, & originated upon  $y^{\rm e}$  sub= tile matter only. 198, Of y<sup>e</sup> diverse If it be said that however y<sup>e</sup> action is excited, sorts of faint it must affect  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole medium both groSs & subtile, I answer, true, but with lights effect so slight, that as to  $y^e$  groSs it sig= nifyes next to nothing, when  $y^e$  action ori= ginally falls upon ye groSs, that by mecha= nick law must propell  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  finer with full velocity, but if  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  originall cause falls upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  subtile matter, that hath not power to propell y<sup>e</sup> groSser, but slightly, & with little (or(comparatively) no velocity. Now these coruscations are observed to appear in y<sup>e</sup> air by accidentall production, or upon y<sup>e</sup> earth by corruptions, fermenta= tions & y<sup>e</sup> like. 199 Of y<sup>e</sup> accen= First as to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  air, we have considered that dible mix= some part of it is not water, but spirits, as sulphur, & salts of various denominations

for those

tures in y<sup>e</sup> air.

238r

(542,) Physica

{\_}

for those readily take wing, & will spring  $\{/from y^e Earth\}$  into  $y^e$  air by common heat, but most by y<sup>e</sup> intense heat of y<sup>e</sup> sun, or from cu= linary fires; but little or none of y<sup>e</sup> ashy kind of matter riseth, but all that, remaines behind,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  fire having pickt out all that is spirituous from it, & joyned it with ye watery part of y<sup>e</sup> air in one common fluid, This flu= id being perfectly transparent, we do not discenre  $y^e$  differences of  $y^e$  matter where= of it is composed in manner as we see y<sup>e</sup> sorts of earth, as stones, sand, or water; therefore think it to be a particular u= niform substance, & wonder at any thing that appears otherwise in it. But if we consider it, as variously composed of hete= rogene parts, & with analogy to things sensible, as water & earth; we must opine that there are in it, composed at y<sup>e</sup> spiri= tuous parts, coagulums, vegetation, & perhaps animalls

animalls, as there is in standing water cor= ruptions, insects, & vegetables, & so in  $y^{\text{e}}$  earth veines plants & animalls{. Wh}en any of y<sup>e</sup> slighter veines of spiritous matter in  $y^{\rm e}$  air, accend, they run on in trains, & shew a faint lumen, of  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  there is great variety,  $\{\underline{we}\}\ call\{\underline{/d}\}\ coruscation$ , & have no violent effects, because their beginning & continuance, is in such subtile matter as propells only its like, without affec= ting ye groSs air. And this doth not impeach, but coincides with what hath been said of tempestuous lightning; for that w<sup>ch</sup> is fiery in it, proceeds in coagulums bredd in compreSsure, most of  $y^{\text{e}}$  aqueous mat= ter being distilled from it, for these are GroSs, compact, & dry, & capable of explosion with direfull effects. W<sup>ch</sup> never happen, but in such outrageous circumstances, as appear by  $y^{\rm e}$  [postliminious?] coruscations after a storm,  $w^{\rm ch}$  are innocent, as many other contingent

{\_}}

{\_}}

(544) Physica

contingent (tho very observable) lumens in  $y^{\text{e}}$  air have been.

Hitherto of coruscations in y<sup>e</sup> air; of w<sup>ch</sup> I must observe, as of all this kind of (cold)/cold lumens that they are very weak, & scarce or not at all perceivable but in y<sup>e</sup> night, when ye power of daylight is gone. Now we come to those coruscations, w<sup>ch</sup> are found about y<sup>e</sup> earth; & these are either from animalls, or from fermentation or corruption of ani= malls,  $y^{\rm e}$  Glow-worm or fly is  $y^{\rm e}$  most consi= derable; whose body & skin are transparent, &  $y^{\rm e}$  action of life in  $y^{\rm e}$  creature at certain times is such as gives a faint impulse upon y<sup>e</sup> finer matter of y<sup>e</sup> air, without any (dis= cernable) effect upon y<sup>e</sup> more groSs parts, so is seen tho no heat is to be felt. If it be asked why in some fly's not in all, & why in some evenings & not in all? I answer from like cause as produceth flys, some with 4 leggs & some with six, some blew & some redd

200 Coruscations about y<sup>e</sup> earths surface very weak Physica

(<del>5545</del>) 240

redd. It is enough to shew that where such lights are, It follow[-?]s not that there must needs be fire in any degree (except what is common to all animall life) because y<sup>e</sup> powerfull part of y<sup>e</sup> air, is not concer= ned in y<sup>e</sup> originall cause of such lumen w<sup>ch</sup> is derived from & led by a subtile mat= ter only.

But to persue these trifling matters a little further; we have a phaenomenon, w<sup>ch</sup> is fre= quently seen, & not only admired, but made y<sup>e</sup> subject of many fabulositys. It is called will in y<sup>e</sup> wisp & never seen but in y<sup>e</sup> night, & then moving desultorily, up & down, & in places low, & seeming at con= siderable distantce, & if any person goes towards it, y<sup>e</sup> appearance will go from him, & perhaps lead him in to a bogg, about w<sup>ch</sup> places it ins most often seen; & if y<sup>e</sup> person retires it comes towards him. And all this is ama=

201. Of ignis fatuus or will in y<sup>e</sup> wisp

(546)

## Physica

is amazing to  $y^{\text{e}}$  common people;  $y^{\text{e}}$  whole secret of this matter is that ye lumen is wholly from aSsemblages of flyes,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$ we may observe to sport afore us in a summers evening in columns; & those may be observed to use  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  very practics of Will in y<sup>e</sup> wisp, that is, if you go towards one, ye column falls back, & if you retire, it follows, & sometimes it will be on one side & sometimes on  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  other. But when it is dark, &  $y^{\rm e}$  distinct bodys of these flys cannot be discerned, what part of them falls below  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  plane of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  horison (for above there will be, even in a dark night, too much light for this purpose) as from rising ground towards a valley will be seen, but higher, that is, above  $y^e$  horizon= tall plane, no such lumen for  $y^e$  rea= son before hinted will appear. When men travell in open countrys, without any light, but in extremity of darkneSs, there will

## Physica (<del>547</del>) 241

will be a fancy that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  paSsage is between two walls; w<sup>ch</sup> proceeds from a distinction of  $y^{\rm e}$  horizon what  $^{225}$  is above & what beneath it, for no darkneSs will deprive that distinction  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  is by means of some degree of light w<sup>ch</sup> will make such diffe= re/e\nce. Now in viewing this dancing lumen there is nothing comparative to judge of this [....?]distance by, therefore when ye flyes are not two yards from your eyes, they will be judged to be at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  remotest distance.  $\mathtt{W}^{\mathtt{ch}}$  must be so, for  $y^{\mathtt{e}}$  desultory motion cou'd not appear so swift, nor wou'd  $y^{\rm e}$ angles open as uthey seem unleSs  $y^{\rm e}$  ob= ject were near. And by these deceptions folks are amazed, & none cou'd ever by following find  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  specter out.

But now to come to those things that are solid & palpable; first y<sup>e</sup> sea burning (as it is called) is remarkable, y<sup>e</sup> phaenomenon is when oars strike y<sup>e</sup> water; A strong lumen

202. Of y<sup>e</sup> sea burning, & y<sup>e</sup> colours

 $^{\rm 225}$  Above the 'w' in the word 'what', MN has drawn a small circle.

(54<del>9</del>8) Physica

lumen attends, as it were struck out of  $y^{\text{e}}$  body of  $y^{\text{e}}$  water. So when  $y^{\text{e}}$  surges rage & froth,  $y^{\rm e}$  whole sea seems to burn, & it is hard to perswade a mariner that it doth not. This proceeds from that light  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is in  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$  air tho it be very little, for no time is absolutely dark. But y<sup>e</sup> surface of water will be exqui= sitely opack, especially if it be smooth for that can send no light to  $y^{\rm e}$  eye,  $w^{\rm ch}$ must be of common observation; But when  $y^{\rm e}$  oar breaks  $y^{\rm e}$  surface of  $y^{\rm e}$  wa= ter, & turns it into numberleSs forms such as they call frosting, or like froth, then  $y^{\text{e}}$  light,  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is in  $y^{\text{e}}$  sky, is thrown from such broken surface, & upon y<sup>e</sup> smooth, that is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  dark surface, appears quasi a light extraordinary. And  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ like is  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  case of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  waves, for when those curl & froth &  $y^{\rm e}$  topps,  $y^{\rm e}$  little light from ye sky upon them appears more vivid to

y<sup>e</sup> eye

(<del>549</del>) 242 Physica

 $y^{\text{e}}$  eye than from  $y^{\text{e}}$  common water of  $y^{\text{e}}$ sea. Another phaenomenon of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sea is when it appears of deep blue, or strong green,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ water it self is always  $y^{\rm e}$  same, limpid & transparent. The reason is,  $y^{\rm e}\ Azure\ sky$ reflecting from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  disturbed water shews it blew, & if  $y^e$  sky is cloudy with some azure it is green, & if all cloudy, it is grey or muddy; all by reflexion.

Other noted instances of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  faint shinings in  $y^{\text{e}}$  dark, are either such as from  $y^{\text{e}}$  con= stitution of  $y^{\text{e}}$  parts (as  $y^{\text{e}}$  sea burning) seem to shine, or else have a positive lumen attending them;  $y^{\rm e}$  former are chiefly rot= ten wood, & things  $w^{ch}$  carry a lively white colour; for  $y^e$  lyittle light in  $y^e$  air re= flecting from such in a place accounted very dark, shews them distinguisht from those things, w<sup>ch</sup> reflect no light at all. It is

203; Of rotten wood shi= ning

(550) Physica

is common for travellers in a dismall dark night, to put ye white horse before, for he will be distinguished when no under= colour can be discerned; & of this sort rotten wood, such as we call touchwood seems to shine in y<sup>e</sup> dark, y<sup>e</sup> rather be= cause  $y^{\text{e}}$  superficies is broken, upon  $w^{\text{ch}}$ y<sup>e</sup> little light sparkles; & all is by vertue of its whiteneSs, & not by means of any lambent fire; that it is corrupted is certain, but it is a dry finished corruption, & con= duceth only by a severence of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  parts; There is wood full as rotten but of a dark colour,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  never affords any shew of lumen. And I believe a very white paper, or rather snow wou'd shew as much as any touchwood.

Of those things that shew a positive lumen; Besides y<sup>e</sup> flyes touched before, are jellys ab:<sup>t</sup> oyster shells, moisture in y<sup>e</sup> hair of dog or catt

204. Of shinings about ani= mall sub= stances

catt, in an humid evening, that when stro= ked back will shew a light; &  $y^{\text{e}}$  like from human bodys, as when  $y^{\rm e}$  lady was frighted, that letting her shift fall from her, it flasht as all on fire. So  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  heads of fish begun to corrupt, & flesh also, witneSs  $M^{\rm r}$  Boyle's lucid loyn of veal.  $^{226}$  All  $w^{\rm ch}$ imply a kind of fermentation residing in y<sup>e</sup> receSses of y<sup>e</sup> most subtile matter, w<sup>ch</sup> can be sensible by no touch, but that of y<sup>e</sup> eye, & that so weak, that in y<sup>e</sup> utmost darkneSs, it is but just discerned; & we must not pretend to know more of them; & I had not pretended to say so much, but for speculation of our sensitive powers,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  , as y<sup>e</sup> propertys of sensible things have no termination. In  $y^{\text{e}}$  absence of  $y^{\text{e}}$  greater, we perceive ye leSs, & I doubt not but one long confined in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  deepest dungeon, woud come to perceive all parts of his mansion plain enough; for  $w^{ch}$  reason  $D^r$  Halley thought

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>226</sup> Robert Boyle, 'Some Observations about Shining Flesh, Made by the Honourable Robert Boyle; Febr. 15. 1671/72 and by Way of Letter Addressed to the Publisher, and Presented to the R. Society', Phil. Trans. January 1, 1672 7 5108-5116. (see: http://rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/ 7/81-91/5108.full.pdf+html)

{\_}

205. How heat & fire is excited by action upon mettalls. (552) Physica

thought his four interior worlds,  $\{\underline{to / tho}\}$  no sun, had light enough to supply ye inhabi= tants.  $^{227}$ 

#### Of Divers Phaenomena.

The physicall cause of fire struck out between a steel & flint, hath been much mistaken, when ye flint hath been sup= posed a secret repository of fire. Whereas fire as such is lodged in neither of them, but created by a rending from  $y^{\rm e}$  steel very small slivers of y<sup>e</sup> mettall, in such a violent motion as makes a fusion of it; & every spark is a piece of melted steel, &many be seen with a microscope upon a paper, over w<sup>ch</sup> fire hath been struck, in all ye little burnt specks as small shot like that w<sup>ch</sup> flys about a smiths forge when he ham= mers upon a flame heat. And ye very likeneSs of this may be seen by file dust of iron thin dropt over y<sup>e</sup> flame of a candle, for each

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>227</sup> Edmond Halley (1656-1742) proposed his 'hollow earth' theory in 1692 while attempting to explain magnetic variation: 'An Account of the cause of the Change of the Variation of the Magnetic Needle; with an Hypothesis of the Structure of the Internal Parts of the Earth', Phil. Trans. 1686 16 563-578 (see: http://rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/16/179-191/563.full.pdf+html). Halley imagined the earth being made of a number of concentric globes (sized proportionately to Mars, Venus and Mercury) each with different magnetic polarities. From p. 572 onwards he speculates more broadly about other features of such an imagined globe, including the flow of water between them, the different forms of life possible owing the absence of sunlight, and going so far as to make literary allusions to classical hells.

each particle will melt & fall in vivid sparks as from flint [&?] steel. This shews in what proportion great things resist more than small, for it must be fur= nace or forge to flux great lumps, when a candle or strokes will melt  $y^{\rm e}$  pul= viscula.<sup>228</sup> And it is very remarkable that drawing or extending mettalls conduceth much more to raise a heat in them than any other kind of force. It is common for smiths to hammer a piece of iron, till it is hote enough to kindle a match,  ${\tt \&}$ so they do not visit neighbours, as they say, to fetch fire. But this must be tough &ductile iron, & not such (as(cold) will burst rather than draw, &  $\underline{y}^{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{they}$  hamer usu= ally upon y<sup>e</sup> edge of y<sup>e</sup> anvill, to drive it whereby it soon becomes hot, & ye like may be observed, of wire-drawing, or watchspring-making. In all w<sup>ch</sup> actions, y<sup>e</sup> friction of y<sup>e</sup> parts, however slow y<sup>e</sup> motion is, being generall

(554) Physica generall, Excites heat more than down= right blowes; & as nothing under ye sun is hotter than melted iron, so  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  very sparks de[f?]rived from y<sup>e</sup> fluxed shivers of y<sup>e</sup> steel, for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  quantity are as fierce as any fire whatever. 206. The At= It was an old dotardism to conceipt that mosphear fire rose up[w]right to joyn with its pro= preSsing per sphear regnant above y<sup>e</sup> air, The mo= least up dern cosmography hath dismist all those wards di= Ptolemaick fancys, but yet it is worth rects fire & our enquiry to know, by what agency, that plants that mounting property is wrought. And in order to that, we must consider that in way. all fire, there a dispersion of rarefyed mat= ter w<sup>ch</sup> requires much more room than it {\_}} had in  $y^e$  fewell. As for instance {<u>/A candle</u>} throws off round about it  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  tallow rarefyed. This must make a current or stream from it, &  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  way shou'd that take; I answer it shall take that course where it may paSs with

least
### Physica (<del>555</del>) 245

least impediment, & that is up[w]right, be cause y<sup>e</sup> preSsure of y<sup>e</sup> air in perpendi= culo is continually leSs, & consequently resists leSs. This I mentioned before, & touch it again now because of a conformity with another phaenomenon leSs under= stood, & that is y<sup>e</sup> frowth of plants, w<sup>ch</sup> if y<sup>e</sup> stems have strength to carry them, al= ways shoot upwards. And y<sup>e</sup> reason of this is no other than as before, for y<sup>e</sup> air resists y<sup>e</sup> shooting forth of y<sup>e</sup> sapp, & ac= cordingly it must tend that way where it meets with least resistance, w/<sup>c</sup>\h is in y<sup>e</sup> due upright.

Of Water Springs & fountains.

It is not amiSs among y<sup>e</sup> abstruse phaeno= mea of y<sup>e</sup> world, to bring under conside= ration that of y<sup>e</sup> effusions of water, fre= quently iSsuing from earth in most parts of y<sup>e</sup> world, called springs. The benefit of w<sup>ch</sup> to

(556)

Physica

 $w^{\text{ch}}$  to all /ye/ animall kind is incomparable; but common as they are,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  originall cause of them, seems to ly absconded in subter= ranean darkneSs & out of  $y^{\rm e}$  reach of hu= man sagacity to resolv e. And all not for want of [....?] applications & industry, for  $y^{\rm e}$ philologers in every age have inquisited, & in their works indeavoured to explain them: But with so much infelicity, that I cannot say I have yet met with a tol= lerable account  $\{\underline{\tau}\}^{229}$  By what means such quantitys of water are collected in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ bowells of y<sup>e</sup> earth & thrown out, as main= tain all  $y^{\rm e}$  small & great rivers  $w^{\rm ch}$  irrigate  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  face of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth; there hath been no want of conjectures & imaginations, by way of attempt to resolve ye difficulty, & altho put forth with aSsurance enough; but most of them so farr from giving  $% \left( {{{\left[ {{{\left[ {{{\left[ {{{\left[ {{{c}}} \right]}}} \right]_{{{\rm{c}}}}}}}} \right]}} \right]} \right]} \right)$ satisfaction, that I do not care to enume= rate them, as done in imitation of Plutarchs placita

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 229}$  A full stop is here struck out by a vertical line in pencil.

246r

### Physica (

(<del>557</del>) 246

placit philosophorum,<sup>230</sup> therefore I shall take notice of but one solution,  $w^{ch}$  is  $y^e$ last, & I think  $y^e$  best, & owing (as I take it) to our proto-naturalist D<sup>r</sup> Halley, & ha= ving shewed wherein that failes, endea= vour to demonstrate how  $y^e$  defects may be supplyed.

It is supposed that by secrets ducts & cre= vices, y<sup>e</sup> waters of y<sup>e</sup> sea find ways to pe= netrate into y<sup>e</sup> hollow caverns of y<sup>e</sup> earth, w<sup>ch</sup> are to be found in most regions more or leSs, Especially under mountaines, & likewise what with fires dispers't about near these waters, & what with various salts intermixt w<sup>ch</sup> ingenders heat, as y<sup>e</sup> liquors are impregnant & mixt, mighty vapours are raised, & those always ascend, till, coming near y<sup>e</sup> surface, where y<sup>e</sup> cool air occurrs, & condenseth y<sup>e</sup> vapours into water & fills not only y<sup>e</sup> soil abo/u\t y<sup>e</sup> surface, but subsides into y<sup>e</sup> clefts of y<sup>e</sup> rocks, & by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>230</sup> The *Placita Philosophorum* (i.e., the 'Doctrines of the Philosophers') is a lost work now attributed to Aetius (1st or 2nd century BCE). The surviving text (an abridgment of the earlier work by Aetius) was/is attributed to 'Pseudo-Plutarch' (now any one of a number of authors from the 3rd and 4th century CE) to whom certain works are or have been attributed. Together these works added substantially to Plutarch's prestige as an author. Sir Thomas North, a relative of RN and MN, was the translator of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* into English (from Jacques Amyot's French edition) in 1579.

Physica

(558)

& by settling downwards, find crevises & channels, & thereat iSsue in springs, w<sup>ch</sup> collecting make rivers. And what share percolation of rainmay have in this discharge of waters by springs w<sup>ch</sup> can= not but be very considerable, shall be considered afterwards, & it being pre= sumed that y<sup>e</sup> supposalls here are just, y<sup>e</sup> consequences will answer effectually y<sup>e</sup> question proposed.

In y<sup>e</sup> course of naturall philosophy, doubts are to be resolved by means that admitt of no doubt, or at least leSs doubtfull than y<sup>e</sup> matter in question: Now here we doubt what is y<sup>e</sup> cause of watersprings, & are told that y<sup>e</sup> sea finds paSsa= ges thro y<sup>e</sup> earth to y<sup>e</sup> hills, & so in quantity all about, where vapouring breeds hu= midity, that, being condensed, flows out; To this, say we, there is no such inletts, & subterranean pools of sea water, nor fires to raise

to raise steams, nor places near y<sup>e</sup> surface, col= der than in greater depths, to condense them; & who can shew us  $y^{\rm e}$  contrary? there are some particular places where underground fires are observed, & some bituminous ex= halations, as at Aetna &c. but springs are all y<sup>e</sup> world over, & most frequent where is least suspicion of fire; & as to hot springs, if no heat cou'd be derived but from culi= nary fires, y<sup>e</sup> argument foerr them wou'd be strong, but it is well known that wa= ters by various mixtures wil calefy & almost accend, so that for such purpose there is no need of actuall fires. Nor is it found that in  $y^{\rm e}$  regions of such eruptions, wa= ters come forth more frequently, or war= mer than in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  most inland places, where ye sea is least suspected to make any un= derground visits, or fires to kindle so near as to raise any steam from them.

(560)

Physica

{\_}

{\_parts}

Another cause of springs, as I remember hath been touched upon <del>y</del>eby ye same au= thor,  $^{231}$  or some of his {/sequel\ seques}, & that is, filtra= tion. And that operation is, when a fluid gathers into, & wetts loose substances, as linnen, spunge, brick, sand, mould &  $y^{\rm e}$  like, & climbs in capillary tubes, & rising above its surface, even against ye power of gravi= tation. Here it is supposed that ye subter= ranean waters, derived from y<sup>e</sup> sea, wett y<sup>e</sup> soil, & climb up in small cavitys, & from thence collect & iSsue in springs. Now filtra= tion be/e\ing only  $y^{\rm e}$  action of  $y^{\rm e}$  fluid parts laying hold of  $y^e$  parts of a solid (in  $parts[\underline{/s}]$  immersed, tending always to a com= mixture, never riseth so as to make a dis= charge, syphon wise, unless  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  body moistned returnes & ends lower than y<sup>e</sup> superficies of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  water that wetts. As when a towell is put into a bason, & part is in y<sup>e</sup> water but  $y^{\rm e}$  greater part hangs over, & lower than y<sup>e</sup> surface

 $^{\rm 231}$  i.e., Edmund Halley, see note on fol. 551v, above.

y<sup>e</sup> surface of y<sup>e</sup> water in y<sup>e</sup> bason. The towell shall by degrees gather water, & at y<sup>e</sup> low= est part dropp, till y<sup>e</sup> bason is empty. In this posture y<sup>e</sup> towell is (quasi) a spring, but y<sup>e</sup> fountain springs cannot be wrought in that manner, because y<sup>e</sup> discharge cannot be so low as y<sup>e</sup> sea water from whence y<sup>e</sup> great quantity is drawn. But when y<sup>e</sup> bo= dy is satiated, were it a spunge, or any other[,?] y<sup>e</sup> filtration ceaseth & y<sup>e</sup> moisture hangs as suspended, & dropps nothing. And this is y<sup>e</sup> summ of y<sup>e</sup> experiments of fil= tration w<sup>ch</sup> cannot be applyed as any cause of water springs.

Another cause of water springs, w<sup>ch</sup> must be allowed to be considerable, but not to a degree as some have supposed, is per= colation, w<sup>ch</sup> is of y<sup>e</sup> ordinary rains & melted snows, w<sup>ch</sup> settle thro y<sup>e</sup> sand, or mould neer y<sup>e</sup> surface of y<sup>e</sup> earth, & at a certain depth collect & find vent, & iSsue

### (562) Physica

iSsue in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  valleys, whence rivers have their beginning & increase. Some of these are taken to be perennall, being seldom, others w<sup>ch</sup> they call Land springs are frequently dry. These are supplyed chiefly, but not on= ly, by rain & snow water, of  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  no small quantity falls upon y<sup>e</sup> surface of y<sup>e</sup> earth, but a good part must be allowed to eva= porate by y<sup>e</sup> suns heat, & to solidize in plants & foSsills, but there is enough, as ye nature of all fluids is to settle lower & lower, & still  $y^{\rm e}$  lowest earth has most mois= ture, so that at certain depths, if wells or mines are sunk  $y^{\text{e}}$  water (w^{\text{ch}} they call  $y^{\text{e}}$  springs) flow to  $y^{\text{e}}$  great nuisance of  $y^{\text{e}}$ miners, who are forced to evacuate their pitt with engines, & yet to be soon drowned out again; & sometimes at ye stroak of an hack a vein shall be touched, & a bagg of wa= ter break, to  $y^{\rm e}$  oSs of  $y^{\rm e}$  work & perhaps some mens lives. Now it is obvious to consider, that if a

### Physica (563) 249

if a vent were found or coud be made in some valley below these watery depths, a copious spring must be y<sup>e</sup> consequence; Such as are every where found without help of y<sup>e</sup> sea to flow to flow out in valleys where rivers commonly run; But not without some considerable additament, as I shall shew.

The work of finding fault, I know, is ea= syer than to mend, but every one shou'd not be foreward, to do y<sup>e</sup> one, without a disposition to do something /in\ y<sup>e</sup> other way; & for that reason I shall endeavour to obtain a probable, if not a certain resolution of y<sup>e</sup> cry{/p}}tick cause of common fountain springs, designing it to be short & clear. And therefore in few words I af= firm that all y<sup>e</sup> water springs in y<sup>e</sup> world proceed wholly & soley from y<sup>e</sup> air, & y<sup>e</sup> waters drawn from it by one ordinary operation, called distillation. How

{\_}

(569) Physica

How humiditys are raised from water is matter of continuall & notorious experi= ence, & that of steam,  $w^{\rm ch}$  I /might\ call mist or vapour, raised by fire, or in leSser degree, meer warmth, & condensed again into wa= ter by cold, & accordingly in every degree of coolneSs; & having elsewhere maintain= ed that air, denominando a majori,<sup>232</sup> is made up of water evapourated, & redu= cible (as afore was alledged) to water a= gain by colder applications. I need only add, that cold never fails to extract humidity out of warm air, & according= ly it is found that no cool place in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ world is dry; & as  $y^{\rm e}$  contrariety is exas= perated, so  $y^e$  fluor of water from  $y^e$  air is increas't,  $w^{ch}$  is a doctrine well known to all distillers.

Now taking an account of a vast moun= tain it will be found to consist most of rock, & that not continued intire but splitt & cracked infinite ways, in all w<sup>ch</sup> clefts air is

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 232}$  i.e., 'for the most part'.

### Physica (<del>565</del>) 250

air is resident, not stationary, but ventilating as rarefactions & condensations from abroad & within, happen to urge. What is more ap= parent than that water, as upon common marble, must engender in the clefts of cold stone, & run down as we see perpetually happening, when cold gaines upon warmth, as infinte experiments, w<sup>ch</sup> might be set forth, if such were not obvious to anyone's notice, woud demonstrate. And not only condensa= tions within,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  make room, & winds urging from without, draw fresh air condensible into y<sup>e</sup> cavitys, w<sup>ch</sup> supplys a perpetuall dis= charge of water, w<sup>ch</sup> settles, ads ducts hap= pen, to certain vents, & so makes perennall fountaines; that these partake of per= colated water water from rain & dews is not denyed, but y<sup>e</sup> springs upon y<sup>e</sup> sides of stony hills & neer  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  topps must be chiefly, if no wholly, acribed to ye cavernous & cra/c\key productions, because such shew little or no change

(566)

### Physica

no change upon any difference of weather, aswett or dry, as springs in earthy coun= trys do.

But there well appear yet further effects of condensation in producing flows of water, besides those from y<sup>e</sup> ordinary fiSsures among rocks; that is from cavitys in y<sup>e</sup> meer earth; for we see in clay countrys clefts of great wideneSs & depth,  $w^{\rm ch}$  are within as cold as stone itself, & consequent= ly must derive moisture from  $y^{\rm e}$  inclu= ded air. Nay I will not exempt common earth from doing  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  same, for altho that consists of small bodys, yet they are de= vided & have their interstitia, in  $w^{\rm ch},$  air tho in thin quantitys, paSseth or resides & produceth moisture, for underground is always humid, & siccity is not found, but at  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  exterior surface of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  earth, where ye sun & winds come. Now it being a con= stant course of waters commixt with

earth,

earth, [....?] to settle downwards, it is always found that by sinking wells /or mines  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{y}}^e$  waters shew themselves more  $\ensuremath{\&}$  more till they come almost into a lake or flow of so much water, as crys go no further; And this hap= pens to be at such a depth as falls neer a levell in those parts, & where y<sup>e</sup> usuall springs do not extend to drein. But surely all these many sources of humidity are sufficient to supply water to answer all  $y^{\text{e}}$  discharges, & to solve  $y^{\text{e}}$  phaenomena of springs all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  world over, without calling in y<sup>e</sup> seas & subterranian fires, or any precarious energys, but by  $y^{\rm e}$  strength only of such means as we know to be true & effectuall agents in all other instances experimented;  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  I think is  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$ true & only method of physicall science.

(568) Physica<sup>233</sup>

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 233}$  The next five pages are given numbers and headers, but no content.

Physica (569)

(570) Physica

Physica (571)

(572) Physica

252r

# (573) Physica (573) 252

### Of spirituallity

At  $y^e$  entrance of these papers, I toucht upon a shaddow of reason as might be given for  $y^e$  mind having power to move  $y^e$  body;  $w^{ch}$  however a meer conceipt I shall now produce it. And observe forst that it is in Mathematiques agreed, that superficies increase as squares, & solids as cubes of  $y^e$  root; whereby circles or sphears are as  $y^e$  squares, & globes as cubes of  $y^e$  diameter in figures thus.

Roots	Squares	cubes or}	faces or }	As
		solids }	<pre>superficies}</pre>	
1	1	1	6	6 to 1
2	4	8	254	3 to 1
3	9	27	54	2 to 1

And  $y^e$  reverse of this,  $w^{ch}$  I have most to do with, proceeds in  $y^e$  like proportion  $y^e$  solidity decreasing,  $y^e$  superficies (bin pro/portion\ decla

207. Body in statu in= finito im= p[±?]ollible by spirit.

{\_}}

### (574) Physica

declared) increaseth. Now consider that all bodys, w<sup>ch</sup> move, are more or leSs resisted, w<sup>ch</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> case of y<sup>e</sup> motion in pleno, & y<sup>e</sup>then y<sup>e</sup> power of any body to perseverre in motion is according to y<sup>e</sup> solidity, but y<sup>e</sup> resistance is according to y<sup>e</sup> superficies; that is, y<sup>e</sup> action of a body is by y<sup>e</sup> solidity, & y<sup>e</sup> paSsion by y<sup>e</sup> superficies; And these de= creasing, but y<sup>e</sup> active faster than y<sup>e</sup> paSsive principle, to an infinity, y<sup>e</sup> action must expire first, & then it may be said y<sup>e</sup> body is become infinitely paSsive.

What I say here of body at y° expiring is obnoxious to every, almost infinitely weak force, to move it absolutely, may be turned into y° alternate, & be said of spirit by way of increase of power, as in some degre approaching to y° nature of body. And then these extreams mee= ting, of body & spirit [------?]<sup>234</sup> {/in a state of \} in a state of matter

 $^{234}$  'in a state of matter' has been written over another, apparently similiar phrase and then the words 'in a state of' has been inserted later, in pencil, to clarify (!) the reading.

Physica

(<del>575</del>) 253

[-----?]Matter adapted for  $y^{\rm e}$  porpose, why shoud not  $y^e$  one work upon  $y^e$  other, in their severall functions;  $y^e$  body by be= ing moved, &  $y^{\rm e}$  mind by influencing of it to move? & so long  $\{\underline{as}\}$  they conjoin; & when y<sup>e</sup> former is disjointd, as a broken clock, it can perform no longer, & that is death.

I know there are many gaping objections against this novell imagination, w<sup>ch</sup> I am sure cannot clearly be answered, but yet I shall make y<sup>e</sup> best of my way towards  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  mark, whether I think it may be reached or not. They may say that body while it is quantum, tho never so small, hath all its proertys, as to be impenetrable, active, resistable &c. as truly & integrally as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  greatest. And then it may be added, that in all degrees of

diminution

{\_}}

208. Some ob= jections considered.

(576) Physica

diminution, being among  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\mathrm{e}}$  like dimi= nished matter, all proportions of force & resistance take place, as in all other instances of bodily commixtures. I can= not pretend to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  contrary, but body while such, is like other sorts. But still who can answer for things in a state of infinity? we judge by what we feel & know, & cannot depart from those images, as in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  cases of vacuity & time; But all will not amount to a demonstration of a negative. We aSsume y<sup>e</sup> nature of body [<del>by</del>?]from our experience of it; but when ye questi= on falls beyond & without all expe= rience & tryall, y<sup>e</sup> generall rule may not hold, & some influences may[, nay?] have effect of w<sup>ch</sup> we can give no man= ner of account. And there is this reason to conceive that somewhat of this kind lyes

lyes absconded in infinity, for no Anato= mick searches or sagacity can discover a commune sensorium; ^235 It is probably in  $y^{\rm e}$ brain, & that is a willderneSs; It is also reasonable to suppose it to be in some point, but where is it to be found? I therefore conclude that wherever it is, y<sup>e</sup> seat is in infinite ([....?]I must {/I must]} use y<sup>e</sup> {\_} 29.9 word) minuteneSs. Immense effects from That  $y^e$  mind,  $w^{ch}$  certainly is not body, is  $y^{\text{e}}$  cause of most of our corporeall agi= petite causes causes tations; no one without a conscious  $\{/lye\}$  lye, will pretend. For ask any one, can you rise or {\_} sitt still as you will? Can any honest man say no, or ingenio[/.?\]us man say that {\_}} your words have compelled me to /sitt\ still, & this by a mechanicall deduction? There is so much underyably to be said for free will, & that, apart from body, that I

<sup>235</sup> That there was an actual part of the brain given over to the '*commune sensorum*' ('common sense') had long been assumed. It was imagined to be part set aside for assimilating all sensory data from all the 'five senses' (it being the sixth, in many accounts). Common sense, therefore formed the site of sensory *identity*.

## Physica (<del>577</del>) 254

shall

(578) Physica

shall not exaggerate  $y^{\rm e}$  matter but pro= ceed to answer an /other  $\$  objection,  $w^{ch}$  is that such sufficient force will not flow from a point, next to indivisible, to move such immense machines as our bodys are. I answer, that, as in other cases, so here we must distinguish between y<sup>e</sup> cause & ye occasion; it is not ye spark of fire that lifts a bastion, Nor a grain or two that directly causeth  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  motion of 200<sup> $\pm\pm$ </sup> weight in a ballance. wWe know that our bodys are a compage of springs, w<sup>ch</sup> continually draw one again another. And it is also plain that when we spon= taneously move any part, it is a ballance/ce\/ce determined that doth it. For a muscle is always upon stretch or tension, &when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  antagonist muscle fails, that draws, & so alternatim, & when y<sup>e</sup> alternate doth not give way,

it is a

### Physica (<del>579</del>) 255

it is painfull cramp. And there cannot be a greater disporoportion in practise, be= tween  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sensorium, how small soever  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force springing from thence may be conceived to be, than there is between  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  force of a spark &  $y^{\rm e}$  weight of  $y^{\rm e}$  bastion. In all those cases y<sup>e</sup> pilots force determines greater powers, elsewhere provided for his porpose, so  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ mind operating by y<sup>e</sup> sensorium determines  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  chief powers of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  body organized for spontaneous action. I say'd ye sensorium was certainly a point. But what if such points may be, many, & resident not only in  $y^{\rm e}$ brain, but in other parts of  $y^e$  body? of this some short mention about muscular motion.

But waiving further notice of muscular action at present, a subject reserved to a= nother place;<sup>236</sup> & having hinted a conceipt of body & non body or eSsence incorporeall being

 $<sup>^{236}</sup>$  Here is another hint at further volumes devoted to particular parts of North's natural philosophy.

(580) Physica

being united in infinite minutneSs, I shall persue a little further to see how farr that thought may lead towards a solution of those profound misterys of generation & ve= getation; & first as to inanimates (as common vegetables are reputed) they are propagated of branches, & each budd is a branche & every seed is a budd; w<sup>ch</sup> they call plantula, & in some, as in y<sup>e</sup> seeds of tulips, are discovered subplantulae; & by like proceSs, if art might advance y<sup>e</sup> discovery further, we shoud discern  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  like proceSs of such seminals, one beyond another, indefinitely. This shews that plants are originated in minuteneSs inconceivable, I do not call it infinite, but most  $\{\underline{/certinly}\}$  that no means will instruct a vegetable, of  $w^{\rm ch}$ there is not any one  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is not derived from ga germen of ye like kind. But whither, or where any such beginning resides, or whither any thing incorporeall (I dare not say spirituall) is adjoy

{\_}

### Physica (<del>581</del>) 256

is adjoyned to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  substance, or negatively that there is none, I may not positively determine. But so farr I am certain, that no valid solu= tion of vegetation by any mechanicall agents hath yet fallen in my way; ye con= ceipt of Borellus, that it is produced by force of compreSsure will not be sufficient for plants in a veSsel, where compreSsure is as strong as abroad, without a free air, will not grow. Nor is it in y<sup>e</sup> power of art to make a plant, of any sort whatever, old or new, without a seminall,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{ch}$  argues that there is somewhat in vegetation more than purely mechanicall. If we shoud say there is in plants a motion analogous to what in animalls is called peristaltick (for both plants & animalls) are all vascular) we sh'd be at a loSs to find  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  muscular power as well in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  one, as in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  other, that actuates it. But in some plants  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  plastick vertue seems to reside in all parts or in every fibre as in elms

(582) Physica

elms y<sup>e</sup> severed from y<sup>e</sup> earth will derive numberleSs shoots, that transplanted may become trees, but from what origin doth not appear.

As for animalls & their origination, I think that now after all  $y^{\rm e}$  inspecting & experi ments that have been made, it is conclu= ded that it is universally vermicular, & that  $y^{\rm e}$  distension & form of all creatures proceeds from nutrition. The vermicule whether in ovo or in utero; was once a part of y<sup>e</sup> animall of w<sup>ch</sup> it was genera= ted; & (to use  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  analogy) such a part of  $y^{\rm e}$  parent, as a seed is of a plant, & that is (dimension excepted) alter Idem.<sup>237</sup> And whatever spirit of substance incorporeall, is in infinite minuteneSs. And whatever spirit or substance incorporeall, is in in= finite minuteneSs adjyoyned to ye parent it it/s\ taken derivatively by  $y^e$  creature in its first formation & separation, & so by means of nutrition

211. All ani= malls in ori= gine ver= micular.

## Physica (<del>583</del>) 257

of nutrition  $y^e$  animall is produced, & after its full increase, & similar propagation, when  $y^e$  vegetation & operation of  $y^e$  vitall in= struments fail,  $y^e$  compage diSsolves, & whate= ver of it was incorporeall ceaseth, &  $y^e$ whole substance falls under  $y^e$  laws purely mechanicall, without being in= fluenced by volition,  $w^{ch}$  cannot be mate= riall.

212. Of y<sup>e</sup> im= mortallity of y<sup>e</sup> soul I might here expatiate & largely enough upon y<sup>e</sup> subject of analogy between plants & animalls, respecting nutrition as well as origination; since that is b#y roots & branches, only in animalls they act in= ternally, & in plants from without; but I am called away to a matter of greater importance. And that is y<sup>e</sup> immortallity of y<sup>e</sup> soul. For it will be alledged that this scheme supposeth it impoSsible; & that every solution of y<sup>e</sup> substance de= termines y<sup>e</sup> unity. All w<sup>ch</sup> I grant, Except only in y<sup>e</sup> case of human kind. The philo/sophers\ have

(584)

## have strove by their metaphysicall dis= courses, to prove human souls immortall; but all in vain, for mankind has no principles in nature whereupon to derive such a dogma. And $y^{\rm e}$ transmigrations & other conceipts of $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ ancients are meer dreams. But we have a more sure word that setts us at ease & reconciles $y^e$ whole matter, & that is Revelation, where upon we rest our holy religion & faith. And other reasoning than from thence $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ subject will not bear. Thereby we are told that all men as well ye wicked as $y^e$ just shall rise with their bodys, & be judged according to demerit; And what is this, but that $y^{\rm e}$ union between $y^{\rm e}$ souls & bodys of men shall not determine by death, but whatever becomes of ye GroSser members, w<sup>ch</sup> S<sup>t</sup> Paul calls y<sup>e</sup> naturall body, another body shall remain consis= ting of spirit, & substance, capable of sense, memory, happyneSs or y<sup>e</sup> contrary; to appear at y<sup>e</sup> generall

Physica

Physica (<del>585</del>) 258

generall resurrection. And this immor= tallity of y<sup>e</sup> soul, is not a naturall con= sequence, but a Devine gift bestowed upon human kind, whereby their natures are exalted above y<sup>e</sup> rest of y<sup>e</sup> animall world; it being declared that beasts shall perish, that is (Dying) cease to be, & never revive.

213, But not of [<del>y</del>e?] Brutes

There may be diverse objections to what is here advanced; as that either spirit must grow & be nourished, as animall substances are, or it is inconceivable that spirit united to such pusille matter as y<sup>e</sup> inchoamenta<sup>238</sup> of animalls are sup= posed to be, shou'd increase with y<sup>e</sup> matter so as to influence it in y<sup>e</sup> ordinary opera= tions of life. To this I answer that accor= ding to our notion of spirit, w<sup>ch</sup> goeth no further than a negation of body, we must conceive, that it admitts not of more or leSs, but is y<sup>e</sup> same in y<sup>e</sup> vermicle as in y<sup>e</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>238</sup> i.e., 'basic constituents'.

(586) Physica

as in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  man. And for extent of power, it lyes not in quantity but in nature,  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\&}}$  what that is, but by some obscure effects, we know not, & scarce can gueSs. Buyt this scheme of our immortallity we get ridd of certain dangerous pre= judices. For while some argue, that  $y^e$ soul w<sup>ch</sup> subsists in thinking, & is distinct from body , w<sup>ch</sup> (body) cannot think, (& so is independent) & is not extinguisht by  $y^e$  dissolution of  $y^e$  body{s?}. Others (oppo= sing) will inferr that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  souls of brutes are immortall: for bating speech, & science. (w<sup>ch</sup> flows from it,) there is no more ev/i\dence of reason in men than in brutes, & an im= partiall judge that stands by & observes must so determine; for  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  reason, say they, ye souls of brutes are alike immor= tall. All  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  pretension is dissolved by  $y^{\mbox{\tiny e}}$ reference of  $\bar{i}mmortallity$  to  $y^e$  Divine bounty with respect to human kind,

whose

souls otherwise wou'd sink in mortallity as those of  $y^{\rm e}$  brutal kind do.

Of The Almighty.

It is no new observation that among  $y^e$  an= cient philosophers, y<sup>e</sup> question, an sint Dij,<sup>239</sup> was matter rather of contention than of conviction. For they had not y<sup>e</sup> uncontestible evidence of miracles, as y<sup>e</sup> Jews had, & under them, with undubitable {/certeinty\} and confirmation,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$  eChristians. But when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  Orthodox philosophers alledged  $y^{\text{e}}$  popular arguments of  $y^{\text{e}}$  order & beauty of y<sup>e</sup> universe, y<sup>e</sup> cou'd not be without a wise & powerfull disposer, no more than a Vergilian verse be found descri= bed upon y<sup>e</sup> sea-sand by meer chance; W<sup>ch</sup> arguments, tho to a reasonable creature  $\{/are\}$ convincing enough, yet did not prevail, be= cause they were not of that sort as must stop

214. The scep= ticism of y<sup>e</sup> ancient Atheists.

{\_}}

{\_}

<sup>259</sup>r

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 239}$  i.e., 'whether there is a God'.

(588) Physica

stopp  $y^{\text{e}}$  mouths of importune & captious Atheists, who denyed all consequences, & called for demonstration even of  $y^{\rm e}$  first prin= ciples & affirmed y<sup>e</sup> world to have been from eternity, & all things to follow e= ternally in a series of neceSsary causes. And our modern unbelievers to avoid  $\boldsymbol{y}^{\text{e}}$ consequence, that when anything is per= ceived, there must be a perceiver, or thin= king being, that is not  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  thing perceived or thought of, go further, & say that matter it self, organized for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  porpose, as common automata, or rather than fail, without so much  $puz/z\le may$  think & per= ceive; So for  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  work of perception no need of any incorporeall powers, nor to rule /any part of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{y}}^e$  universe; & in this manner perception is made a quallity, inherent in matter,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  is monstrous absurd.

260r

(<del>589</del>) 260 Physica 215. And as to my thinking, this shou'd alarm  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ Danger of y<sup>e</sup> at= gentlemen/en\ of y<sup>e</sup> attractive sect, shewing how dangerous their proceeding is, in affixing tractive quallitys to matter, as attrahent, propellent, scheme centripetal, &  $y^{\rm e}$  like, least it be said, that it is from thought (in matter) that such quallitys proceed, & so deliver up y<sup>e</sup> cause of all incorporeall agents/cys\, & powers. What else can be y<sup>e</sup> consequence when all y<sup>e</sup> symp= tomes of appetite peculiar to living animalls, are turned into materiall quallitys? And if  $y^{\rm e}$  latter had /had  $y^{\rm e}\backslash$  titles of appetites & aversions given them, there had been a plain con= 216, sequence. The mode or argu= But now having touched upon this circum= ing de stance, I must need observe that y<sup>e</sup> great Deo<sup>240</sup> ana= author of those principles, seems as ear= lytick or est in persuit of Theologicall evidences, Synthetick as any before him, but because ye ordina ry proceeding, w<sup>ch</sup> , he says, ought to [.....?] be anali/ $\frac{(\text{anali})}{\text{tick}}$ {\_}} and not

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 240}$  i.e., 'out of, or from God'.

(590) Physica

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{\&}}$  not Synthetick, that is, not to go from principles (meaning I suppose some hy= pothesis) to  $y^{\rm e}$  phaenomena, but from  $y^{\rm e}$ phaenomena to principles, as y<sup>e</sup> likelyest course to come at a certain proof of a Deity, And so we must stay or wait for phaenomena whence to conduct y<sup>e</sup> analysis. It may be I do not perfectly understand y<sup>e</sup> tendency of this distinction; but I am very sure that no physiologer will pretend to discover any principles, but what he deduces, or pretends to de= duce from experience of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  phaenome= na. And it wou'd be inconvenient to stay for our proof of  $y^{\rm e}$  Deity, till  $y^{\rm e}$  phi= losphers have collected phaenomena enough to fulfill  $y^e$  demonstration, of  $w^{ch}$  we think we are poSseSed already; And that will happen when  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  R. Society have made a collection of experiments whereby to compose
compose a compleat hypothesis, & leave no phaenomena unresolved, & till then nullius in verba.<sup>241</sup> But herein y<sup>e</sup> great author contradicts himself.

But now to resume  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  consideration, of y<sup>e</sup> popular arguments, I touched upon at first, w<sup>ch</sup> have been insisted on by  $y^e$  best philosophers, & chief advocates for y<sup>e</sup> christian religion, as a full proof of y<sup>e</sup> Deity & providence: I mean y<sup>e</sup> notori= ous & admirable disposition of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  worlds aeconomy,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  cou'd not have been so by chance, or otherwise than by almighty wisdom & power. I fear  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  subject hath not been urged to  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  best advantage, but that in another manner more might be made of it, so as to bring it home to a demon= stration. Therefore I shall presume to new mould it, & if I seem to derogate on  $y^e$  one side/e\, I hope to make full amends on y<sup>e</sup>

217. The po= puar argum:<sup>ts</sup> to be im= proved

 $^{\rm 241}$  i.e., 'words mean nothing' - with reference to the motto of the Royal Society.

261v

on  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  other, And first, building upon what hath been held forth in these pa= pers, I d{ $\underline{i/e \setminus v}$ }est y^e materiall world of all {\_}} of all order, regularity & beauty. And considering nof further than naturall means, y<sup>e</sup> rotations of y<sup>e</sup> Aethereall mat= ter with  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  planets conveyed in it, might have fallen into this way, or any else, as we see ordinary vortications of fluids happen; But in this instance I must re= serve y<sup>e</sup> consequences of y<sup>e</sup> following dis= course. 218 Next I have ascribed all these Ideas of Regularity & beauty sence,  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  are ordinarily attributed to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ not in na= objects that cause such sensations (as subsisting in them) unto our internall ture but art facultys, whereby we perceive light, co= lours, audibles, & all  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  varietys of touch. So that if all sensitive animalls wer an= nihilated, None of those things (in Idea per/ceived\) wou'd

Physica

(592)

# Physica (<del>593</del>) 262

woud have any existence. And as to re= gularity, that belongs to art, & not to na= ture, for it cannot be made appear that among all y<sup>e</sup> individualls, there is an equal= lity or precise form to be found, but all things are as we term it irregular, in= commensurable & unequall. And there is not a naturall beauty in any thing, but all of that sort is referred to ima= gination & usefullneSs, &  $y^{\rm e}$  perfection of body consists in  $y^{\rm e}$  3 dimensions,  $w^{\rm ch}$  grant= ed, all bodys, {() whatever  $y^e$  shapes are, {)} are equally perfect. This, w<sup>ch</sup> must be owned to be  $\{\underline{/a}\}$  true state (since specifick quallitys are, or soon will be laid aside) demonstrates that  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  sensible eSsence,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{ch}$  is called  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  soul, is different or distinct from y<sup>e</sup> materiall part.

And by means of y<sup>e</sup> union of these 2 ESse= ces, mentall & materiall; there ariseth an Idea of power, & particularly of y<sup>e</sup> mind over

219 The space of y<sup>e</sup> uni=

{\_} {\_}

verse in= finite (594) Physica

over  $y^{\text{e}}$  body, to move it, as in  $y^{\text{e}} \text{ practisce}$  of muscular motion is demonstrated; & every one (not lying to himself) must own it. And this power being quallifyed or confined gives an Idea of more & leSs, & a clear notion of a poSsibility of a power greater than our own, which may influence matter in grea= ter degrees than we can do, altho aSsisted by mechanism, as hath been shewn. Now by our attention to body, we gain an Idea of [....?]space. But we cannot comprehend it in larger extent than as our practise of ex= perience, & reasonable deductions from thence enables us. And from thence we argue (tho we do not comprehend) great distan= ces, & so by mental repetition, we conclude even to infinity. Now space having degrees of more or leSs, we are as well satisfyed in our minds of an infinity of space, as of any thing whatever that may be artifi= cially demonstrated; & no person whatever of y<sup>e</sup> least philosophicall sence, will pretend to opine

{<u>space</u>}

Physica (<del>595</del>) 263

to opine that space is not infinite, & if any such appear, they must be turned up for scepticall impertinents not to be discours= ed with.

Now to consider mankind, that is a creature arose in weakneSs, & want of most things desired; but having abillity in some mea= sure to serve it self, as to wahat it wants, & continually more, as practise or experi= ence inlargeth; in that proceSs finds y<sup>e</sup> ex= tent of its power, w<sup>ch</sup> consists in a sponta= neous agitation of certain parts of his body, one way or other as there is occasion: And in that exercise it will soon appear that ye power is very defective, & that ye mind or volition cannot in many respects be cor= responded by consentaneous actions. And ye Idea of this defect, that is, of a limited power, by continuall (addition (as before of space so here of abillity) we are led to con= ceive that w<sup>ch</sup> is called infinity. And in this way of thinking to derive a firm opinion & belief of it

220. The al= mighty power de= monstra= ted (596) Physica

of it,  $w^{\rm ch}$  no abstraction or power of  $y^{\rm e}\ {\rm mind}$ whatever, will obviate or restrain, as for instance in  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  case of space, Is there a speculative person in y<sup>e</sup> world, that doth not really opine, that space whither ple= num or vacuum is extended in infinitum? It is a neceSsary conclusion w<sup>ch</sup> is comprised in y<sup>e</sup> Idea of every reall eSsence w<sup>ch</sup> in y<sup>e</sup> abstract admitts of augmentation, & diminution, & accordingly  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  mathematicians define their quantum. How th{en it/f} no m{ore/an} doubts of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  infinity of space, can any one doubt of an infinity of power? There is a certain Idea of space as also of power, both limi= ted, but equally capable of increase; &  $y^{\rm e}$ same Idea of infinity attends both. And a man may as well doubt [....?]whither there [....?]is any space existent ultra y<sup>e</sup> limits of things sensible; as whither there is any power greater than what he feels in him= self, or observes in others. If space hath no limits

{\_}}

# Physica (<del>597</del>) 264

no limits, what shou'd limit power? There= fore there is invincible reason for men to believe, & consequently to put their trust in an infinite & eternall power, w<sup>ch</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> almighty. And this tends not to set up a parity of power in matter. For matter hath a being but not power, but what is obnoxious to that of y<sup>e</sup> imma= teriall infinity. For our immateriall part (our will) controuls it in tanto, & so y<sup>e</sup> di= vine eSsence controuls it in toto. For y<sup>e</sup> power is conceived as opposed to matter, & in a state of infinity is absolute, to order, create, or destroy it: And nothing can resist an absolute power.

If clara & distincta perceptio<sup>242</sup> be (as y<sup>e</sup> phi= losophers now say) y<sup>e</sup> utmost criterium of truth, this existence of an almighty power is fully proved, & in a strikt sence demon= strated. But since importune people will always resort to cavills, w<sup>ch</sup> they will call objections

221. Diverse ca= vills an= swered

<sup>242</sup> i.e., 'clear and distinct perceptions'; for Descartes 'omnis clara et distincta perceptio procul dubio est aliquid' i.e., 'everything perceived clearly and distinctly is something incontrovertible'; 'ideoque procul dubio est vera', i.e., 'that which is incontrovertible is true'. Descartes, Meditation VII, 62). 264v

(598)

### Physica

objections; I woud examine what may be moved against this truth. And 1. if they say, that infinity is ultra  ${\tt captum},{\tt^{243}}$ & no proposition can be built upon it. I answer, true, when infinity hath been taken as a substance determinately, much puzzle hath followed, & nothing conclu= ded; but when taken as a proceSs only, as when y<sup>e</sup> mathematicians say, quo vis dato major vel minor,<sup>244</sup> it stands fairly in a proposition, & in a proper subject may take  $y^{\rm e}$  place of a datum; as when it is said  $y^e$  hyperbole & asymptote meet in a point at an infinite distance.<sup>245</sup> 2. If they say, we may affirm as to power, but not to volition & knowledge, & some other attribute; I answer, that all those are comprised in y<sup>e</sup> Idea of infinite pow= er,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  cannot be without  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  attributes. Body in motion hath power by contact reci= procally as to some modes of it, but no knowledge

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 243}$  i.e., 'beyond comprehension'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>244</sup> i.e., 'where the given force is greater or less'.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 245}$  These two terms are discussed below on fol. 267r ff.

knowledge or will. Therefore infinite power, w<sup>ch</sup> controuls body, & is of that kind, as is adumbrated by  $y^{\rm e}$  mind of man, can= not exist without an infinite measure of all that in man is finite that is know= ledge, will &c. If 3, they say{/, \} true, space in poSsibillity may/y\ be infinite, but whe= ther it is actually so, is another question, so power, &c. I answer that this includes a contradiction; for  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  limitation it self must be extended & so continually. And as to power that, if at all, must be li= mited by some other power,  $\boldsymbol{w}^{\text{ch}}$  is infinite. 4. If they say that incorporeall power to move body may be found in animalls, but no where else. This is Gratis dictum, 246 & cannot be answered but by fact, w<sup>ch</sup> is miracles of w<sup>ch</sup> there is incontestable evi= dence. Yet who can say that vegetables, of w<sup>ch</sup> no mechanicall account hath been, or, as I opine, can be given, may not (in suo genere<sup>247</sup>

{\_}}

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>246</sup> i.e., 'stated voluntarily', or 'stated for free'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>247</sup> i.e., 'by its nature, or kind'.

(600) Physica

genere) partake; if they say, powers in= corporeall may not cease by death, & so brutes be immortall. I answer, quoad y<sup>e</sup> specifick substance of y<sup>e</sup> animall (Except of human kind by speciall providence) they do cease, but not quoad y<sup>e</sup> univer= sallity of power; & it is y<sup>e</sup> union only, & neither y<sup>e</sup> substance, nor power that can indefinitely be said to cease. As a bottle of fresh water immerst in y<sup>e</sup> sea, & then broke, there is no annihilation of what was contained, but y<sup>e</sup> form determined, so as it may be truly said of y<sup>e</sup> bottle of fresh water is no more.

And lastly it may be said that here we have confirmed y<sup>e</sup> attractive scheme, by allowing that y<sup>e</sup> world is actuated by pow= ers (inherent in, that is) united by efficacy with body. I answer that y<sup>e</sup> question is not of pure poSsibillity, for y<sup>e</sup> Almighty (so pleased) might have made matter to be attrahent

222. The attrac= tive schema considered & conclusion

attrahent, impellent, depellent/pellent\, centripe= tall, or otherwise as may be invented, or imagined. And so destroy all naturall know= ledge & turn all changes, & events to a mi= racle. But by ultimate exerience it is found, or from paralell reason inferred that (animall powers apart) there are no naturall effects, but what are derived from a single principle, & by consequence absolutely neceSsary, as extension, & there= by impenetrabillity,  $w^{ch}$  hath been  $y^e$  sub= jest of  $y^e$  foregoing discourses. & main= tain/ain/'d by reference to fact in all exa= minable instances, from thence con= cluding by parity to instances in groSs, but not of elements distinguishable. And if  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  disposition of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  world upon one single & manifet principle, with y<sup>e</sup> adjunct of animalls so (as it were by art) consituted, there shall emerge  $y^e$  sence of celestiall glo= ry, & harmony, & all that is called wonderfull & great

266v

(602)

### Physica

& great, in every one severally & yet all de= rived out of y<sup>e</sup> same common principle; be a symptome of infinite wisdom & power, here it stares us in  $y^e$  face, & will not in any conscientious measure, be contrave= ned. And as to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  consequences, with regard to human concerns, & expectations of good & will, or what is understood by y<sup>e</sup> word pro= vidence, they are y<sup>e</sup> subject of greater un= dertakings, & may be found in y<sup>e</sup> wrightings of diverse Christian authors; Here it is pro= posed to discourse; only of naturall means, & to leave all that is supernaturall, or di= vine to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  profeSsors of those misterys, or rather to  $y^{\rm e}$  consciences of common men, who seldom want knowledge/e\ enough to secure them a happy eternity of soul & y<sup>e</sup> best sensuall life of y<sup>e</sup> body, w<sup>ch</sup> latter is by common experience found not to sub= sist out of a religious obedience, & ye ordi= nary exercise of virtue.

267r

223. Of y<sup>e</sup> a= symptotes & hyper= bole Physica (<del>605</del>) 267

# Some Mathematical Myst<u>erys</u>

It may be observed that some topics of ye genus Mathematicum carry a face Ae= nigmatiq, & y<sup>e</sup> artists are content, if not affecting, that they shou'd be so, altho' capable to be developed, & made fa= miliar to common understanding, & I know but one author who hath been so kind to be explicite in such matters as fell in his way to discourse of, & that is y<sup>e</sup> incomparable D<sup>r</sup> Barrow, whose generall lectures, 248 are a specimen of what of this kind is desirable. And there he toucheth upon y<sup>e</sup> most abstruse matters, even to  $y^{\rm e}$  squaring  $y^{\rm e}$  circle, (so farr as it may be carryed) in a manner plain, significant, & even by y<sup>e</sup> tyrones most intelligible. As for instance  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ 

hyperbole

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>248</sup> Isaac Barrow, 1630-77, was at various times (and with interruptions) Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, Gresham Professor of Geometry and fellow of the Royal Society in London, and (the first) holder of the Lucasian Chair in Mathematics at Cambridge which he resigned in 1669, to be succeeded by Isaac Newton. He was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, previous to RN's brother, John North. RN, who knew him well, only ever mentions him with respect and affection. The 'generall lectures' referred to were his *Lectiones Mathematicae xxiii; In quibus Principia Matheseôs generalia exponuntur: Habitae Cantabrigiae A.D. 1664, 1665, 1666. etc.*, London, 1684, (later translated as: *The Usefulness of Mathematical Learning explained and demonstrated: Being Mathematical Lectures Read in the Public Schools at the University of Cambridge. etc.*. Translated by the Revd. Mr. John Kirkby of Egremond in Cumberland, London, Stephen Austen, 1734).

(604) Physica

hyperbole & its aSsymptotes;  $y^{\rm e}$  property of y<sup>e</sup> is that those lines continued together /come nearer,  $\$  but extended in infinitum, shall not touch. This is not well apprehended without entering deep into ye conicks, but is made plain thus. A cone standing upon its base, & cut right down by a pl{ain } paralell to its axis, y<sup>e</sup> outline of that sec tion is that curve form  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is called an hyperbole, &  $y^{\rm e}$  same cone cut right down thro its axis, shews a rectilinear triangle including  $y^{\rm e}$  same, & every other hyperbo= licall section (as before paralell) & y<sup>e</sup> lines of that triangle, are ye Asymptotes;  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  running on to infinite, never meet, or as some please to say, meet in a point at an infinite gdistance,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  is  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  same thing in other words. Here  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  figure D. RF. is  $y^e$  hyperbole, & ABC, its asymptote. Whereof y<sup>e</sup> lines AB, & DE, & BC, & EF, tho continually approaching shall never meet

{\_}}

268r

<space for<="" th=""><th>diagram&gt;</th><th>meet; &amp; what is all this,</th></space>	diagram>	meet; & what is all this,
		but a cone of infinite ex=
		tent? For carry out y <sup>e</sup> cone
		ABD. as farr as you will,
		y <sup>e</sup> section & plane hyper
		bolick goes along with it,
		& can never coincide with
		y <sup>e</sup> axis or a (supposed) sec=
		tion thro' it; This is made a proof of y <sup>e</sup> di=
		visibillity of matter or space in infini=
		tum, for if y <sup>e</sup> 2 sections were within a hairs
		breadth of each other or infinitely leSs,
		y <sup>e</sup> consequence were y <sup>e</sup> same. And if pa=
		ralells exterior to y <sup>e</sup> asymptote were drawn
		wider ad infinitum, it doth but shew y <sup>e</sup>
		hyperbolick section to be made so much
		further from y <sup>e</sup> plane of y <sup>e</sup> axis.
224,		
Ellipses		The Ellipse is a figure described by a sec=
circles		tion obliquely thro' both sides & axis of a
corrupted		cylinder

### Physica

606

cylinder or cone, & is termed ovall; it is ge= nerated also by  $y^{\rm e}$  perspective view of a circle, or by  $y^e$  shaddow of an upwright wheen projected obliquely upon a level plane, & divers other ways mechanically, but however it is generated, it is but a corruption of a circle,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  in such case always becomes ovall. And propertys of a circle will be found in y<sup>e</sup> correspon= ding ovalls, & there by work is made for ye analytick Geometers to demonstrate; as for instance that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  radius of an ellips sweeps equall spaces in equall times. This must be true when  $y^{\rm e}$  figure turns ypon  $y^{\rm e}$  um= bilicus or center,  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  answers  $y^{\mbox{\scriptsize e}}$  center of  ${\bf a} y^{\rm e}$  circle. As here there is not a point in y<sup>e</sup> circle ABCD, w<sup>ch</sup> hath not its correspondent point in y<sup>e</sup> ovall abcd, & not for  $y^{\ensuremath{\text{e}}}$  circumference only but in  $y^{\ensuremath{\text{e}}}$  whole area. And if in equable rolling of  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  circle y<sup>e</sup> spaces

<space for diagram>

# Physica (<del>607</del>) 269

 $y^{\rm e}$  spaces of  $y^{\rm e}$  ovall in times shall be une= quall, y<sup>e</sup> spaces from y<sup>e</sup> center extend, & those nearer  $y^{\rm e}$  center contract accordingly; & what appears more or leSs in y<sup>e</sup> times, as every one may see that observes  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  shaddow from  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  sun of a coach-wheel upon  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ground. This is not strange. But they say ye orbs of  $y^{\text{e}}$  planets are ellipticall &  $y^{\text{e}}$  sun about w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> planet rolls is in a focus. I know that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  foci of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  orbs are so neer  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  umbilici, that ye differrence may not be much; but take an ellipse formed mechanically or by pro= jection with foci very distant, & it seems  $y^{\rm e}$ proposition cannot be true. For let  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  ovall a.bcd. turn upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  focus e & than  $y^{\text{e}}$  part c cannot paSs round by d to a & in time so much swifter than from a by b to c, as  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  space acd. is larger than  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  area or space abc. And whoever observes  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  shaddow  $\boldsymbol{I}$ mentioned shall find that ye parts at d shall move

(608) Physica

move with  $y^e$  same celerity as  $y^e$  parts at b, & so  $y^e$  rest as they are opposites to each other. This ovall figure is of vast use in Astronomy, for by  $y^e$  propertys of it they can, from past observed, calculate  $y^e$  whole fi= gure, & when  $y^e$  planet shall arrive at any part. And thereby  $y^e$  unequall course of  $y^e$ sun is demonstrated, & tables of equation made, w<sup>ch</sup> are most usefull to compare with clocks & watches. But as to  $y^e$  Newtonian Ellips consult  $y^e$  demonstration.

The misterious disputes about y<sup>e</sup> angle of contact between a strait line tangent & a circle, is merry, as any dispute where no= thing is y<sup>e</sup> subject must needs be. Some say it is an infinity of approach diminutively; & then prove that one infinity may be greater than another, & so fall into pro= portions, & y<sup>e</sup> infinity may be increast to infi= nite. As AB. tangent, Ac, y<sup>e</sup> circle, AD a leSs circle, tangent at y<sup>e</sup> same point. the angle

225, Chimera's about y<sup>e</sup> angle of contact

# Physica (<del>609</del>) 270

angle CAB is no quantity, no more than DAB, being both infinites diminutively, & yet  $y^{\rm e}$  infinite DAB is greater than  $y^{\rm e}$ infinite CAB. And if y<sup>e</sup> tangent be of a plane to a sphear, y<sup>e</sup> infinites are augmen= ted to infinite. Now in account of rectili= near angles, CAD, is nothing, because CA, is not a right line, but an arch, & ye rules of rectilinears will not hold of curves, or curves & right lines mixt; as between y<sup>e</sup> hyperbole & asymptote, & of sphericall triangles, for such have more  $\{ \underline{/degrees} \}$  than two right angles. Therefore Euclid determines right that ye angle of contact is no angle or no quantum. But in curvity it is an angle, & comparative, as DAB, is greater than CAB, & so foth, & y<sup>e</sup> semicurve solid angle between  $y^e$  plane &  $y^e$  sphear will be as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  sphears, wherein is no mystery as  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$ jargon of terms often makes in mathema= ticall as well as in other sciences.

When

{\_}

270v

226. Of incom= mensura= billitys

### (610) Physica

When a Geometer affirms, that there may be & often are quantitys, bewteen w<sup>ch</sup> no number in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole stock of Arithmatick integer or fraction, can be a common mea= sure; his doscurse is commonly taken to be Aenigmatick, or y<sup>e</sup> case very wonderfull; for so long as there is a liberty of subdividing, it must at last (surely) come to a scantling apt to both. For if upon a (supposed) tryall it shou'd fail, then divide on, in  $w^{\mbox{\scriptsize ch}}$  proceSs there is no end. Now in truth  $\boldsymbol{y}^e$  wonder wou'd ly on  $y^{\text{e}}$  other side, if it cou'd be shewed that any two things in  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  whole universe were either equall alike, or commensura= ble; for nature it self is compound of ir= regularitys, & whatever is otherwise, is not of nature, but of art, & a creature of meer supposition grounded upon poSsibillity, for artfull purposes & not otherwise, as all Mathematicall objects are. The cause of this misapprehension that increase & di= minution of numbers & quantitys proceed alike & correspond

# Physica (<del>611</del>) 271

& correspond each other (cujus contrarium verum est) is,<sup>249</sup> for that in arithmetick y<sup>e</sup> progreSsion is by units or aliquots,<sup>250</sup> so as y<sup>e</sup> parts always measure y<sup>e</sup> whole, w<sup>ch</sup> parts are distinct & determinate; But in geo= metry  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  progreSion is not by parts deter= minate, as by stepps, but continuall, and major or minor than quo vis dato, 251 whereby no number can be so multiplyed or sub= divided as to measure every geometrick quantity; let  $y^{\rm e}$  minutes be small to  $y^{\rm e}$ utmost of imagination, yet while it is [a?] quantum, & pars extra partem,<sup>252</sup> we may proffer a dimension a little more or leSs, & sic ad infinitum, By this it appears that there may be quantitys between w<sup>ch</sup>, arithmetick, out of all its stores, cannot furnish a common measure, & those are incommensurables.

227, The demon= stration.

It appearing here that such may be, it re= maines to shew that  $y^e$  same in diverse instan=/ces\ have

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>249</sup> i.e., 'the opposite is true'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>250</sup> i.e., 'several' (i.e., any number greater than one).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>251</sup> i.e., 'the given force'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>252</sup> i.e, 'a value', and 'part outside parts' (i.e., 'side-by-side').

271v

# (612) Physica

have been by  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  mathematicians <code>paSsim</code> demonstrated. And this they have derived upon  $y^{\text{e}}$  notion of a quadrate  $w^{\text{ch}}$  is a num= ber, or (w<sup>ch</sup> is always understood) a substance generated by number multiplyed into it self. The product is y<sup>e</sup> square, & y<sup>e</sup> multi= plyer is y<sup>e</sup> root, w<sup>ch</sup> (root) whither expreSsi= ble or not, is always a mean proportio= nall between y<sup>e</sup> unite & y<sup>e</sup> square. Some numbers are termed square numbers, as 4, 9, 16 &c because these are numbers as  $2x^{2=4}$ , [2x3=9?], And 4x4=16, will produce them, whereby y<sup>e</sup> proportions are 1:2::2:4, 1:3::3:9. & 1:4::4:16. But if y<sup>e</sup> numbers are not square numbers (so as these may not be any numbers self multiplyed that will produce them) as 2, 5, & 7, &c. then sup= posing quantitys, equall to them,  $y^{\rm e}\xspace$  roots of those quantitys, (that is mean propor= tonalls between  $y^e$  unite & those numbers) cannot

Physica (<del>613</del>) 272

cannot be expreSsed by any other num= bers, however subdivided: but they are no= ted by a mark of radicallity, as they call it, thus  $\sqrt{w^{\rm ch}}$  always signifies a mean proportionall. Now seeing that ye number 2 is no square number, & y<sup>e</sup> mean propor= tion between 1 & 2 inexpreSsible by num= bers, it follows that all quantity's w<sup>ch</sup> are to each other as 1 to 2. are incommensura= ble. or without a poSsibillity of any mea= sure common to both, as mean propor= tionallity requires. And this holds of all y<sup>e</sup> equimultiples as infinitum. Therefore in every geometrick square,  $y^e$  square of  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  diagonall being equall to  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$  square of ye two sides. That is as 1 to 2 whereof ye roots are inexpreSsible, it follows, that  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ diagonall, &  $y^{\rm e}$  sides of every quadrate are incommensurable.

Now if I may be allowed further to touch y<sup>e</sup> mathematicall point with a physicall or rather

(614)

### Physica

or rather vulgar style, waiving  $y^{\rm e}$  me= thods of expreSsion, & demonstration or= dinarily affected in those cases. I shall now take into consideration y<sup>e</sup> (hitherto) insuperable probleme of squaring  $\boldsymbol{y}^{e}$ circle,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  is to prove that a content of any circle is equall to ye area of any quadrate or right-lined figure. It is well known that this was undertaken by Archimedes, & hath been persued by most geometers ever since. The incompa= rable  ${\tt D}^{\tt r}$  Barrow spent, as he said, more time upon proving one single approach to it,  $w^{\mbox{\tiny ch}}$  was to find a strait line equall to an arch of a circle, than many men have done in acquiring y<sup>e</sup> skill of some gainfull profeSsions, & all he got for his pains, was a demonstration, as he thought that it was impoSsible to be done. About y<sup>e</sup> same time M<sup>r</sup> Hobbs published his Eureka,  $^{\rm 253}$  & was by ye virtuosi so exposed that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>253</sup> i.e., in his Elementorum Philosophiae Sectio Prima de Corpore of 1655. This prompted Wallis' Elenchus geometriae Hobbianae of the same year. An appendix to the English edition of 1656 (which was known as De corpore) Hobbes responded to Wallis with his 'Six Lessons to the Professors of Mathematics'. For a fascinating overview of the dispute between Hobbes and Wallis see Jesseph, G M, Squaring the Circle. The War between Hobbes and Wallis, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1999.

Physica (<del>615</del>) 273

that his positiveneSs was pleased to say, that either he was madd, or all  $y^{\rm e}$  world was madd.  $^{254}$ 

The method of Archimedes was that  $w^{\rm ch}$  they call of exhaustions & approximations, w<sup>ch</sup> at every instance comes neerer, but never closeth. As suppose a circle to be divided into equall isosceles triangles, having ye cusps at y<sup>e</sup> center, & y<sup>e</sup> basea angles touching y<sup>e</sup> circles, then there will be a segment subtended by each base. Then multiply these triangles, & ye segments will diminish, untill  $y^{\rm e}$  bases &  $y^{\rm e}$  periphery come to a coa= lescence, that is to say never: for  $y^{\text{e}}\xspace$  proceSs is infinite. As in dividing a strait line, first by half, then by half of ye residue, & so on to infinite, w<sup>ch</sup> can never be, because after every division, there will still re= main a part to be divided. This bredd a sophism, as proving that one body cou'd not by motion ever come to a contact with another

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>254</sup> 'ANIMADVERSIONS Of Dr Wallis, upon Mr Hobs's late Book, De Principiis & Ratiocinatione Geometrarum. These were communicated by way of Letter, written in Oxford, July 24. 1666. to an Acquaintance of the Author, as follows: Since I saw you last I have read over Mr. Hobs's book Contra Geometras (or De Principiis et Ratiocinatione Geometrarum) which you then shewed me. A New Book of Old matter: Containing but a Repetition of what he had before told us, more than once; and which hath been Answered long agoe. In which, though there be Faults enough to offer ample matter for a large Confutation: yet I am scarce inclined to believe that any will bestow so much pains upon it. For, if that be true, which (in his Preface) he saith of himself, Aut solus insanio Ego, aut solus non insanio: it would either be Needless, or to no Purpose. For, by his own confession, All others, if they be not mad themselves, ought to think Him so: And therefore, as to Them, a Confutation would be be needless; who, its like, are well enough satisfied already: at least out of danger of being seduced. And as to himself, it would be to no purpose. For, if He be the Mad man, it is not to be hoped that he will be convinced by Reason: or, if All We be so; we are in no capacity to attempt it." Phil. Trans. 1665 vol. 1 no. 1-22 289-294, p 289-90 (see http:// rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/1/1-22/289.full.pdf+html).

### (216) Physica

another, because it must paSs by perpet= tuall halves, as before;<sup>255</sup> but y<sup>e</sup> solution was that every stated time was divisible in infinitum as well as every limited space. But to return to y<sup>e</sup> circle; The tri= angles by their laws may describe a mul= tis±/i\ded figure in y<sup>e</sup> circle inscribed, & more numerous than quovis dato, but yet seg= ments will remain, w<sup>ch</sup> destroy y<sup>e</sup> equation, So that altho y<sup>e</sup> triangles may be reduced to a square, y<sup>e</sup> whole circle can never be squared. But yet this approximation, as to all practick uses serves as well as if it were so.

This case of squaring a circle hath in y<sup>e</sup> nature of it a great resemblance with those of surd roots, & in commensurabilli= tys. For y<sup>e</sup> infinity of materiall divisibilli= ty declares that no limited quantum, as every thing that is to measure another must be, can fall into a precise equallity with any

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 255}$  MN/RN refers here to Zeno's Paradox, or the Paradox of the Tortoise and Achilles.

# Physica (<del>617</del>) 274

any incommensurability/bes//les/. Else subdivision might be continued till it arrives at a common measure,  $w^{ch}$  in such cases cannot be; & no one breaks his braines to find a communis mensura<sup>256</sup> between y<sup>e</sup> diagonall & side of a quadrate; but all are sa= tisfyed; & by means of y<sup>e</sup> radicall marks, make such use of y<sup>e</sup> (supposed) proportion as may be allowed. So in case of y<sup>e</sup> circle; a right-lined particelle can never be drawn so fine, to be adapt to a segment of a circle; nor a strait line so small as to become part of an arch; from whence there ariseth a plain incommensurabillity between every strait line, & circular arches whatever w<sup>ch</sup> puts an end to y<sup>e</sup> tetragonism <u>for ever.</u><sup>257</sup> <flourish underline>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>256</sup> i.e., 'common measure', i.e., 'standard proportion'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>257</sup> i.e., the squaring of a circle; a tetragonist was one who sought to square the circle. The OED gives the earliest use of the term (in English print) to Robert Boyle The Excellency of Theology, Compar'd with Natural Philosophy. (as both are Objects of Men's Study.) Discours'd of In a Letter to a Friend... To which are annex'd Some Occasional Thoughts about the Excellency and Grounds Of the Mechanical Hypothesis, London, 1674. In this book Boyle cautioned an enthusiatic natural philosopher not to forget the divine providence behind all phenomena in the world. Perhaps not an intended resonance, but a fitting one, in this last and paradoxial chapter of the Physica.

<unnumbered page> <red BM stamp>

<unnumbered page> <274 Folios JK.B. Dec. 1885. Ex'd AG.>

<unnumbered blank page>

[colophon vii]
(binders paper)
<Department of Manuscript
Record of Treatment, Extraction, Repair, etc.
of MS. no. Add 32,544</pre>

20.3.73 Examined after binding ED>

<colophons vi-i> (binders paper and inner of board cover)